The Forum.

JULY, 1892.

NECESSITY FOR UNIFORM STATE LAWS.

AMERICANS with slight knowledge of Asiatic castes sometimes describe Brahmins as rule-burdened animals. Oriental politeness restrains Brahmins from making retort that no men are bound by a larger number or greater variety of rules, properly called laws, than the self-styled free men of the American Commonwealth. No impartial American jurist can fail to admit that our law is complex, diverse, and bulky. What are the causes of these qualities in our law? Do these qualities constitute defects in law? If they do, what remedy, if any, is available by us?

The American Revolution was preëminently a conservative revolution. Its leaders, while aiming to destroy the political sovereignty of Great Britain in America, were no less intent upon preserving the English laws regulating private rights in America. Succeeding as those leaders did in securing both objects, America inherited a body of laws. This inherited body of English laws was complex. Sufficient evidence for proof will be suggested by the single fact that when the English colonies in America emerged from the colonial condition into that of independence, the laws by which they were governed consisted, first, of the common law of England, so far as they had tacitly adopted it as suited to their condition; secondly, of the statutes of England or of Great Britain amendatory of the common law, which they in like manner adopted; and, thirdly, of the colonial statutes. This inherited body of English laws was also diverse. The causes which, as early as 1776, had produced this result may be discovered in the varying social, economic, and political conditions of England and America and of

Copyright, 1891, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the different English colonies in America, and in the independent attempts of those colonies to change their inherited English law so as to bring it into harmony with the wants of American society.

The issue of the Revolution opened the way for free development of this complex, diverse, and bulky English law into American law. Of the three organs which had previously formulated legal rules for American communities, independence removed the first—the king in Parliament; it left unimpaired the second—the common law courts of the colonies, now States (which have become, in almost all of our commonwealths, also equity courts); it increased, by removing the friction of foreign interference, the functional vigor of the third—the legislatures of the colonies, now States. The adoption of the Federal Constitution by the people of the United States in 1789 did not essentially impair the power of these surviving law-producing organs—the State courts and the State legislatures. Its substantive effect was to give America an additional set of law-producing organs, to wit, the Federal courts and the Federal Congress, and to divide all subject-matters for legal regulation between the Federal and State governments. An incidental effect of this apportionment of sovereign powers by which control over the few subject-matters of national interest was granted to the United States, which as such has no common law, and by which control over the many subject-matters which are of local interest was reserved to the States which have a common law, was to perpetuate in the States the conditions which, in the colonies, had tended to make American law complex, diverse, and bulky. During the century which has elapsed since 1789, new causes, such as the introduction of the steam-engine, the rise of giant industries, the tendency to corporate organization, the rapid growth and increasing mobility of both population and capital, the abolition of slavery, the wide extension of credit, the diffusion of education and the domination of the democratic spirit, have united to create demand for many changes in American law which, by the Federal Constitution, each State was left free to make according to its own will. These changes have been effected by two different agencies: State courts and State legislatures.

The first of these agencies, State courts, have proceeded by extension and modification of the old law to bring it into harmony with new conditions. This process of unacknowledged judicial legislation which issues in case law is, in the opinion of most lawyers, the safest mode of legislation and the means by which many of the greatest improvements have been wrought in the substantive part of the law

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the last century. But it is undeniable that the unceasing use of this mode of legislation by independent courts of many States and the acceptance by all these courts of the doctrine of precedents, which makes every decided case a part of the law with which its practitioners must acquaint themselves, has worsened the form of American law with each successive year. Thus the complexity of our case law long ago began to justify its popular description as "a legal chaos"; its diversity now makes it even for experts "a wilderness of single instances"; its bulk threatens soon to tax human capacity to digest, for though the recorded cases of England, beginning with the reign of Edward II. (1307–1327), fill only about three thousand volumes of reports, those of the United States published since 1789 already fill about four thousand volumes, while current decisions are adding to this body of American reports about one hundred volumes annually. The second of these agencies, State legislatures, have by statutory enactment sought to bring the law into harmony with new conditions. The history of the United States might be cited most aptly in support of the judgment of Sir Henry Sumner Maine that "the capital fact in the mechanism of modern states is the energy of legislatures."

In the first years of our constitutional history two causes began to work in America which together go far to explain this energy in our legislative bodies. The first was the democratic spirit which, after finding literary expression in the writings of the encyclopedists and bearing its first fruit in the American and the French revolutions, engendered the belief that judge-made law was aristocratic and that the popular will should be able to realize its objects immediately. The second was the spread, as beneficial results were observed to follow the abolition of certain inherited institutions and the repeal of certain feudal laws, of that most persistent of modern political superstitions, the belief that all human ills may be exorcised by the sovereign specific of a legislative "Be it enacted." Influenced by these beliefs, Americans have sought to effect the greatest number of the changes they have desired in the most important element of our inherited rules of conduct, the common law, by the processes of legislative enactment.

Despite the waning of this tendency to change the common law by legislative enactment which now has become pronounced in the older States,[1] the present rate of multiplication of statutes in the United States is without parallel in the history of law. Including the Na-

[1] See article entitled "State Statute and Common Law," in "Political Science Quarterly," vol. ii., No. 1, pp. 117, 118, March, 1887.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional Congress and the Territorial legislatures, there are now forty-seven independent legislative bodies sitting annually or biennially in the United States. Though only five States now prescribe regular annual sessions for their legislatures, and though several new States try to limit each session to sixty or ninety days, some thirty sessions of legislative bodies which may codify, or add to, or alter, or repeal the common law are still held each year within the limits of our national territory. The yearly product of these legislative bodies, which sometimes is cited to illustrate "the natural fecundity of low organisms," is from four to eight thousand statutes. Many of these enactments are found to be so crude or incongruous or unheeded that they are repealed speedily. Still this multiplication of statutes goes on from year to year until the certainty of the law is lost amid their confusion and their contradiction, and periodical revision and partial codification is admitted to be necessary.

What, it now may be asked, has been the practical effect of the operation, during the first century of our national life, of these two agencies, State courts and State legislatures, upon the diversity of American law? The most conclusive answer to this question may be given by the simplest description of the present state of the law of our several States upon such subjects as the following:[1]

1. Marriage and Divorce.—Marriage. (*a*) Age of consent. In several States, the statutes being silent, the age of consent remains as at common law—fourteen in the male, twelve in the female. In other States the statutes declare the age of consent to be as follows: in Iowa, North Carolina, and Texas, sixteen in the male, fourteen in the female; in Illinois, Arkansas, Georgia, and Alabama, seventeen in the male and fourteen in the female; in Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, Oregon, North Dakota, South Dakota, New Mexico, eighteen in the male, fifteen in the female; in Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, Idaho, Wyoming, eighteen in the male, sixteen in the female; in Washington and Montana, twenty-one in the male, eighteen in the female; in New York, twenty-one in the male, fourteen in the female. (*b*) Prohibited degrees. In most States these are substantially the same, but some important or curious variations are found. For illustration: No man can marry his first cousin by blood in eleven States. No man can marry his mother-in-law in nineteen States. In most

[1] See "American Statute Law," 1886, by Frederic J. Stimson, arts. 610, 613, 620–635, 260, 264, and 270; also "Report of U. S. Commissioner of Labor on Marriage and Divorce, 1889," *passim.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States, marriages contracted by persons within prohibited degrees are void *ab initio;* in a few States they are only voidable. (*c*) Marriages out of the State. Most States apply to marriages prohibited by their law, when such marriages are contracted elsewhere, the rule of private international law that a marriage valid in a State or country where made is valid everywhere. But important exceptions exist. Thus marriages prohibited for miscegenation are void, though solemnized out of the State, in Mississippi. So prohibited marriages are voidable by decree of court when both parties were resident in the State, and went, with the intention of returning and in order to evade the marriage laws, to another State or country, where the marriage was solemnized, and then did in fact return to the home State, in Massachusetts, Virginia, and West Virginia.

(*d*) License. In some States officials are forbidden to issue a marriage-license to a male under twenty-one or a female under eighteen, and in other States, if either party is under twenty-one, except upon the written or personal application or consent of the parent or guardian. (*e*) Ceremony. Marriages may be solemnized in all the States by any minister, priest, or preacher of the Gospel, but in most States he must be ordained or licensed. Other persons who may solemnize a marriage in the different States vary in statutory description as widely as any justice of the peace, any person who may be licensed by the county court in Virginia on giving a bond of one thousand five hundred dollars, any superintendent of a deaf-and-dumb institution in Illinois and Minnesota, and the wardens of the town of New Shoreham in Rhode Island. In some States a "common-law marriage" is valid—that is, a marriage entered into by mutual agreement of a man and woman to live together as husband and wife, without any ceremony being performed or public declaration being made, their agreement being found by court or jury from the subsequent acknowledgment of the parties, or from the proof of cohabitation, or from the general reputation resulting from the conduct of the parties. Several States require witnesses to a marriage, but the number varies: in New York, one; in Rhode Island, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Nevada, Washington, Idaho, and Wyoming, two; in Louisiana, three; in Pennsylvania, twelve.

Divorce. (*a*) Causes. South Carolina has no divorce laws. The legal causes for absolute divorce recognized by the other States vary in number from one in New York to fourteen in New Hampshire, and in kind from adultery in all the States to habitual indulgence in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violent and ungovernable temper in Florida, or any such misconduct or other cause as is deemed by the court sufficient to defeat the purpose of the marriage relation in Connecticut, Wisconsin, Washington, and Arizona. (*b*) Equal diversity exists in the laws of the different States in respect to the following particulars: the courts having jurisdiction in divorce cases; the period of required residence in the State before filing the petition, which varies from five years in Massachusetts to ninety days in the Dakotas; the kind of service required upon the defendant; the evidence required or allowed; the mode of finding the facts, which in most States is by court, but in others must, or may upon demand of either party, be by jury; the intervention, if the petition for divorce is unopposed, of some official of the State; the facilities for hasty or secret trial, and remarriage.

(*c*) Foreign divorce. Most of the States accept the rule of private international law that a divorce legally decreed in another State or country is valid everywhere. But if an inhabitant of one State obtains a divorce in another State or country for any cause which occurred in the first State while the parties resided there, or which would not authorize dissolution of the marriage there, such a divorce is not deemed valid in all the States. Thus in South Carolina the courts refuse to recognize a divorce granted by the courts of another State even in cases where both parties to the marriage resided in the State granting the divorce at the time of the divorce suit, provided the marriage was solemnized in South Carolina, and in several cases the courts of that State have held second marriages of persons so divorced invalid, and the children of such marriages illegitimate. So in New York, which allows absolute divorce for only one cause, the Court of Appeals has held that while a divorce may be valid in the State where granted, and while a second marriage in such State may be valid in New York, the divorce, if disallowed by its laws, cannot be deemed valid in New York, and the divorced man or woman, if resuming residence in that State after a second marriage, may become liable to punishment for bigamy. Many States, notwithstanding the prolific social evils which may be entailed by judicial decrees which, assuming to divorce a married couple, and doing so within the limits of a particular State or of the United States, leave them married still in other States or in foreign countries in which either may chance to be found, allow their courts to take jurisdiction in divorce cases, though neither party can prove a *domicile* as distinguished from a mere *residence* in the State where the divorce is sought.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. Wills. (*a*) Capacity to make wills. In most States, every male aged twenty-one and every female aged twenty-one and unmarried, being of sound mind, may dispose of property, real or personal, by will; in others, every male aged twenty-one and every unmarried female aged eighteen; in others, every person, male or female, aged eighteen; in two States, Iowa and Texas, every married person, or person who has been married, whatever be his or her age; in one, Oregon, every woman married to a person of full age; in two, Wisconsin and Kansas, every woman of eighteen, if married; in Nebraska, all women of sixteen, if married; in Georgia, every person aged fourteen, male or female; in New Mexico, every male of fourteen and female of twelve. (*b*) Execution of wills. In nearly all States, all wills except nuncupative must be in writing and signed by the testator; but in a considerable number they may be signed by some other person by the testator's express direction, and in his presence, and in a few States wills must still be sealed with the testator's seal. (*c*) Acknowledgment of wills. In several States the law requires that the testator must either sign or acknowledge his signature in the presence of each or all of the witnesses; and in a few States it is also necessary that the testator should, at the time of subscription or acknowledgment, declare the instrument to be his last will and testament. (*d*) Witnesses to wills. In all States the will and signature must be attested and subscribed by witnesses; in a few States by three witnesses, in most States by two witnesses. These witnesses must, in most States, sign in the presence of the testator; but in several, Vermont, Connecticut, Virginia, West Virginia, Utah, and South Carolina, they must also sign in presence of each other; and in a few, New York, California, Arkansas, the Dakotas, Montana, and Utah, they must sign at the request of the testator.

Such being, it is believed, fair examples of the existing whimsical diversity of the laws of the several States, is that quality which connotes complexity and bulkiness a defect in our laws? Only an affirmative answer to this question seems possible. Slightly variant laws of the several States upon a few unimportant subjects may entail only casual inconvenience and trifling expense, but such marked diversity of rules of conduct upon many important subjects, of which illustrations have been given, makes inevitable what all civilized peoples have adjudged an evil, and what Burke aptly described as the essence of tyranny—uncertainty of the law. Doubt about which law, among many, applies to a given state of facts often facilitates com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mercial fraud, loosens the family bond—the ultimate cement of civilized society—and practically legalizes various admitted immoralities. Attempt to solve that doubt involves constant and gross waste of capital by suitors and of skilled labor by bench and bar, which is avoidable, since its cause is not inherent imperfection of language but multiplicity of rules. The resulting delays in finding which law, among many, applies to the case, sometimes are substantial denials of justice. Further, the original justification of many of the differences in the laws of the several commonwealths no longer exists. The varying social conditions and institutions of the different States in 1789 had, as we have seen, their natural expression in diversity of laws. But the industrial, commercial, and political revolutions of the intervening century (1789–1889) have brought about a social unification in America, never before known throughout so extensive a territory, and have produced an American nation—a people knit together by like sentiments and like interests, coextensive with the United States.

With increasing social unification, our States are fast becoming, if they have not already become, commercially one. Such diversity of laws, therefore, as now exists in these forty-four commonwealths tends to become purely obstructive. Under present conditions it is not probable that either vested interests would be endangered or healthy growth be hindered by like regulations. In fact, though the dictum of Chief Justice Chase, in Texas *vs.* White, 7 Wall., pp. 700–725, that "the Constitution in all its provisions looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States," accurately expresses a legal principle, the Constitution, if it is to fulfil the purposes for which it was established, must be so interpreted and so applied from generation to generation as to recognize the biological fact that both Nation and States are living organisms of changing and progressive wants.

What remedy, if any, is available for this evil—diversity of State laws? No answer to this question, presumptively, is entitled to so great respect as that of persons who are familiar with the practical difficulties which attend and follow every change of law. The United States has a large body of such experts. Their organization, the "American Bar Association," with its eleven hundred members representing nearly every State and Territory and including the recognized leaders of the legal profession, may be assumed to express, with substantial accuracy, the consensus of opinion of these experts. One of the objects of this association, specified in its constitution adopted in 1877, is "to promote uniformity of legislation throughout the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union." The present movement for uniform State laws appears to have been initiated by the association in 1882, by its recommending the passage by the legislatures of the several States and Territories of two acts, an act to permit, but not to make mandatory, one form of acknowledgments of instruments affecting real estate and an act to prevent fraudulent divorces, by limiting the jurisdiction of courts in suits for divorce to cases in which at least one of the parties is domiciled, and not merely resident, in the State where the divorce is sought. The first act, which if universally adopted would essentially simplify transfers of titles, was adopted in Missouri in 1883. The second act, which did not aim at uniformity of legislation among all the States in respect to grounds of divorce, but simply to prevent fraud, has been adopted in Minnesota and New Hampshire.

In 1889 the "American Bar Association" advanced this movement by formally expressing its opinion that uniformity in the laws of the several States, especially those relating to marriage and divorce, descent and distribution of property, acknowledgment of deeds, and execution and probate of wills, was desirable, and by appointing a committee, consisting of one from each State, to compare the laws of the different States relating to these subjects, and to report such recommendations as would bring about the desired result. In 1890 this association, adopting the first report of this committee on uniform State laws, recommended the passage by each State, and by the Congress of the United States for the District of Columbia and the Territories, of an act, modelled upon a recent statute of New York, substantially in the following terms:

"The governor, within thirty days after the passage of this act, shall appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, three commissioners, who are hereby constituted a board of commissioners by the name and style of commissioners for the promotion of uniformity of legislation in the United States. It shall be the duty of said board to examine the subjects of marriage and divorce, insolvency, the form of notarial certificates, descent and distribution of property, acknowledgment of deeds, execution and probate of wills, and other subjects; to ascertain the best means to effect an assimilation and uniformity in the laws of the States, and especially to consider whether it would be wise and practicable for this State to invite the other States of the Union to send representatives to a convention to draft uniform laws to be submitted for the approval and adoption of the several States, and to devise and recommend such other course of action as shall best accomplish the purpose of this act."

In accordance with this recommendation, and through the earnest efforts of the local councils of the "American Bar Association," com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

missions on uniform State laws have been created during the past two years in five additional States upon the model of New York. These States are Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, and Delaware. Thus six States, containing a large fraction of the population of the whole country, have committed themselves to this movement. The high character and professional experience of the commissioners appointed is an earnest of faithful labor and wise conclusions.

Early in 1891 the chairman of the committee on uniform State laws of the "American Bar Association" addressed circular-letters to each member of that committee, and also to several judges of the highest State courts and to lawyers who had made a special study of interstate law, requesting answers to the following questions: 1. What special evils or inconveniences, if any, result in your State from the present want of uniformity? 2. In what respect, if any, is greater uniformity desirable in the laws of the various States and Territories in respect to marriage, divorce, jurisdiction and residence in divorce cases, descent, distribution, wills, probate, insolvency, notarial certificates, commercial paper, acknowledgment of deeds? 3. If greater uniformity is desirable, how far is it practicable?

The consensus of opinion expressed in the answers received is remarkable. They show that an almost unanimous agreement exists upon the following points: (1) That variant and conflicting laws produce in all the States the special evils or inconveniences of perplexity, uncertainty, and confusion, with consequent waste, a tendency to hinder freedom of trade and to occasion unnecessary insecurity of contracts, resulting in needless litigation and miscarriage of justice; (2) that greater uniformity on all the subjects designated is desirable and is most urgently and immediately needed in matters affecting directly the business common to and coextensive with the whole country, such as the enforcement of contracts, the collection of debts, the transmission of property, the nature, validity, negotiability, and construction of commercial paper, and the formalities of all legal instruments and the proofs of their authenticity; (3) that sudden, radical, and fundamental changes in the laws of divorce, descent, and distribution, however desirable, would meet with the greatest difficulty, and in most States changes would be more likely to be adopted, if at all, after the general advantages of uniformity in commercial matters had been demonstrated by experience; (4) that the desired uniformity can be secured best by concurrent legislative action in the various States. At its last annual meeting, in August, 1891, the "Amer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican Bar Association," accepting the second report of its committee on uniform State laws embodying this statement of professional opinion and announcing that six States had appointed commissions on uniform State laws, renewed its recommendation that such commissions be created by each State, and by Congress for the Territories and the District of Columbia, and pledged its officers and members to a hearty cooperation both in the establishment and work of such commissions.

Such are the initial steps which have been taken in the movement for uniform State laws. In view of the general admission that the object sought, like regulation of many subjects now regulated by diverse rules, is desirable, and the increasing demand for such regulation of certain subjects recently expressed by such influential bodies as the "National Board of Trade" and the "American Banker's Association," it remains for those States which have not yet joined in this movement to inquire what objections, if any, exist to the mode proposed for the attainment of that object. Two objections are made, each of which seems plausible, but is believed to be unsound.

First, some supporters of the principle of State rights allege that "a systematic movement in the direction of uniformity may destroy the autonomy, or at least the individuality, of the States; that even a self-imposed uniformity tends to centralization, and is opposed to the excellent principle of self-government." This objection has been well answered by the distinguished chairman of the committee on uniform State laws of the "American Bar Association," the Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, of Connecticut. He says:

> "The argument for greater legal unity lies in the national unity. Our people to-day in their business, contractual, and commercial relations are *one* people—one, just as they are one and homogeneous in language, education, literature, and in their whole civic and social life. Variance, dissonance, contradiction, nay, any unnecessary diversity in the fifty subdivisions of the one American people, in the general laws affecting the whole people in their business and social relations, cannot but produce perplexity, uncertainty, and damage. . . . If local self-government means government of a locality by that locality in matters that pertain solely or especially to that locality, it is apparent that, from its definition, that excellent principle has little to do with those matters which affect and interest the whole nation as much as any of its parts."

Secondly, some supporters of the principle of nationality allege that the object sought can be better and more permanently secured by Congressional action, supplemented, if necessary, by amendment of the Federal Constitution. That this method of dealing with variant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and conflicting laws would tend to bring about more complete uniformity and greater permanence than can follow the voluntary action of the different States, and might issue in what its advocates call "national unification of the law," is admitted, but insuperable practical difficulties bar its adoption. It will suffice to specify three.

First, Congress, as now constituted and organized, is already too much burdened to do its work well. What else means the failure of the Fifty-first Congress to incorporate in the enrolled bill which was signed by the President and filed in the State Department, and now is popularly called the McKinley Act, an important section, relating to tobacco and snuff, which is known to have been adopted by both House and Senate? What else explains the passage by the same Congress, on the first Tuesday of March, 1891, of an act to establish circuit courts of appeal, to hold their first terms on the second Monday in January, 1891, and such drafting of that act that if its error had not been discovered and amended before adjournment, cases in which the Supreme Court has appellate jurisdiction then pending therein would have been swept from its docket?

Secondly, Congress, by its failure to exercise the power now vested in it to prescribe uniform laws upon some subjects, raises the presumption that if its power was extended by constitutional amendment to other subjects in which uniform laws would be desirable, no early relief from the evils and inconveniences of diverse rules would be secured. What other inference can be drawn from the omission by Congress throughout a whole century to use the power which, according to the "Federalist" as well as later authorities, it has to legislate upon the subject of interstate commercial paper, and so to end all annoyance and litigation arising from one kind of diverse laws? What else can be inferred from the disuse by Congress, except for three brief periods (1800–03, 1841–43, 1867–78), of its unquestioned power to establish uniform laws upon the subject of bankruptcy throughout the United States, despite the earnest and general demand for such laws by the great commercial bodies in all parts of the country?

Thirdly, Congress could not be vested with power by constitutional amendment to pass laws upon most of the subjects whose uniform regulation is desirable, without drawing to itself power to legislate upon so many other subjects that the equilibrium between Roman power and Saxon liberty, which our fathers sought to establish and maintain through the device of federalism, would be disturbed, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

local government in matters of local interests—that priceless heritage of centuries of toil and strife and sacrifice—would be imperilled. The decisive effect of this subjection is recognized in the report of the committee on uniform State laws of the "American Bar Association" for 1891, which says:

> "The Federal Government can never assume jurisdiction of marriage and divorce in the slightest degree without absorbing eventually all the powers incidental to the subject, including family relations, property relations of husband and wife, guardianship of minors, custody and maintenance of children, legitimacy, and, in fact, everything that goes under the title of the domestic relations, and much more. This, it is evident, the States will not permit. And the same difficulty lies in the path of national action in the other matters in question."

While these objections to the proposal to secure uniform State laws through Congressional action, supplemented, if necessary, by constitutional amendment, must be deemed conclusive, it remains to be noticed that the plan for attaining that object approved by the "American Bar Association" is entirely safe. No State by voluntarily conforming any laws which it now is empowered to enact to a uniform type could lose thereby its constitutional right to repeal or amend them at its pleasure. The rise and growth of this movement signifies that American society is experiencing wants which cannot be satisfied without more uniform laws. Its leadership by the "American Bar Association" is evidence, unneeded by persons familiar with the history of law, that lawyers, despite the oft-quoted taunt that they are "conservators of ancient barbarous usages," are the real law-reformers. The limitation of the present proposal to an attempt to remove the most annoying and serious statutory differences which can be harmonized "without in the least interfering with the autonomy of the States or the freedom of judicial interpretation," makes plain its conservative character. Whatever the immediate result of this particular project for American law reform may be, it cannot be doubted by thoughtful students of our history that, sooner or later, by some method the growing consciousness of American nationality will find expression in more uniform justice without impairing local liberty.

JAMES F. COLBY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COAL SUPPLY AND THE READING LEASES.

I HAVE been requested by the editor of the FORUM to give some information regarding the recent transactions known in the financial world as "the Reading leases." It is a privilege to do so, although the pressure of many duties permits me to make only a hasty reference to the general features of the subject. There are one or two points involved, however, which it is necessary to keep well in mind to have an intelligent knowledge of the question in its relations to industry and trade.

There could—and let me say this at the outset—be no graver misuse of terms than to call the Reading leases an "anthracite trust." This is the creation of a phrase to attract toward the Reading railway the unfriendly criticisms which trade combinations called "trusts" have awakened in certain circles. Nothing has been created by these leases. Under the Reading charter, the railway has simply continued its policy of extension and enlargement which it has systematically pursued in recent years, not only without adverse criticism, but with the hearty and sincere commendation of the public and the press; and I think it cannot be successfully denied that the many additions and extensions acquired by the Reading company under the auspices of the present management prior to those now under consideration, whenever sufficient time has elapsed to warrant a just conclusion concerning them, have resulted in every instance quite as much to the benefit of the communities affected by them as to the advantage of the company. The "Reading leases" mean simply that corporations, each with elements of strength and usefulness to the public which the others did not possess, came into closer relations, the one taking what the others gave and each giving what it could with advantage bestow. The result has been a gain all around, not only to those concerned in the Reading management, but to the public, in whose service alone a profit can be found. The Reading has only followed the policy of other corporations, a policy made necessary by the stupendous growth of the country and distinctly authorized and encouraged by the statutes of every State in the Union, though long neglected by this company from causes which seemed to be beyond the control of its management.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To criticise the Reading system as a commercial monopoly seeking artificial and oppressive gains at the expense of a single article of commerce is either the misrepresentation of ignorance or the libel of a wanton spirit. The Reading has followed the example of others who have developed the agencies of civilization. By precisely such combinations America grows in greatness. We had this example in the consolidation of the New York Central and the Pennsylvania systems. What, in a word, the Reading leases mean is that comparatively small and dependent lines are gathered into one and made strong, useful, and independent. We do what has been done before, and this widely-discussed consummation should be regarded only as another step in the path of national progress, in that the Reading system becomes a more vigorous and potent factor in the problems of transportation upon which the prosperity of the country largely depends.

The Reading system proposes to itself a twofold duty. It will bring the products of its territory—coal among the rest—home to the consumer upon surer and better terms, and to the manifold industries along its various lines the raw material and supplies which enter into their products. It will assure to the thousands of investors in the Reading securities their undoubted right to some return for the money invested. In this will be found a complete explanation of the motives of the management in negotiating the leases. It is a mistake to suppose that there is, or has been recently, any material or substantial competition between the transportation lines as to the carriage of anthracite coal; the carrying of the coal from the various mines and from the various regions is mainly determined by the ownership or control of the lands or by the necessities imposed by geographical location. Corporations have been formed acquiring the coal lands. These corporations, acting under existing laws, obtained their properties and hold them by the tenure of law. They are as much the possession of their owners as a government bond or the homestead deed. The corporations as coal-mine owners are in close relations with the Reading and other companies. As a consequence, the competition about which so much is written is between individuals and corporations producing and selling coal, and not between the transportation companies carrying the coal to the market. This condition is in no wise altered by the Reading leases. The same mines are tributary to the same railroads as before; each line serves the same markets, and neither line gains nor loses a ton of anthracite traffic as a consequence of our transportation arrangements.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In considering the anthracite-coal question, we must remember that the supply is exhaustible. We are taking from a fixed quantity, the accretion of ages, which when used can never be re-created by any agency known to man. To squander this treasure is an injustice not alone to ourselves, but to those who come after us and to whom we should not leave a barren heritage. Science enables us to know approximately for how many generations these anthracite deposits will endure, and the student of the coal problem can see how far the people may hope to enjoy them. If they are squandered as other resources quite as valuable have been, we come to the real oppression of prices, for the cost would advance as the supply grew less, until coal became an article of luxury. The magnitude of this problem will be appreciated when we reflect that there is now no question more seriously considered by English statesmen than the effect upon the empire of the ultimate exhaustion of the coal supplies of the United Kingdom.

Economy in production must be observed by improved methods, and in the unification and strengthening of industrial processes we have a more prudent, practical, and economical system of mining, enhancing the security of the investors in coal properties, promoting the comfort and assuring the more regular employment of the laborer, and all ultimately inuring to the benefit of the consumer of coal, if not in the lowering of prices, when they are already too low considering the cost of production, at least in the way of continuing the supply at moderate prices. Pennsylvania has special concern in this as so many of her industries depend upon anthracite coal. These vast and necessary institutions are concerned in its management. This can best come from the economies, the unification of service implied in the Reading consolidation as to the matter of transportation, and from the new arrangements entered into by the coal producers.

The allegation that the prices of coal have been advanced to extortionate rates under the recent arrangements is the burden of many articles in the press. I read of "the untold millions" which are to be taken out of the meagre earnings of the poor as a consequence of the alliances and the proposed economies in the coal business. There can be no better reply than to study prices during the past four years. Here are the commercial circulars giving the prices in May, 1892, at the tidewater points of Weehawken, Hoboken, and Perth Amboy. Grate coal is quoted at $3.75 a ton. This is thirty cents higher than in 1888, twenty-five cents higher than in 1890 and in 1891, and the same as it was in 1889. These figures show how little in four years

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prices have varied from the average. In egg coal the circulars quote the May rate as $3.90. This was the quotation in 1889, while in 1888 it was $4.00, showing a fall in four years of ten cents a ton. Stove coal quoted at $4.15 was the same price in 1889 and $4.25 in 1888; in that also a decline from 1888 of ten cents a ton. Chestnut coal is quoted at $3.90, as against $4.00 in 1889 and $4.25 in 1888, a decline of thirty-five cents a ton. Compare the May quotations of grate, egg, stove, and chestnut coal in 1892 with the May quotations of 1888, and we see that in grate alone has there been an advance. There has been a fall of ten cents a ton in egg and stove and of thirty-five cents a ton in chestnut.

These latest reports are cited to show that there has been no advance over that which ruled five years ago. As a matter of fact they show that coal in its various forms has kept an even pace, in some years a trifle more and in others a trifle less, the average about the same, subject to the fluctuations of trade and those mutations in the supply and demand from which no business, commercial, financial, or railway, is free. These figures show also that the Reading railway is none the less disposed to conservative methods now than when it was a part of a struggling system. And in these quotations will be found the best assurance of the sincerity of the management when the declaration is made that the economies of administration will not alone be to the security of the investor, but to the advantage of the consumer.

If the argument were sound that the policy of the Reading railway militated against the public, such a deplorable result would be a novelty in industrial annals. We see what the consolidation of harmonious interests has done in the building of our Western commonwealths, the opening of the way to millions of homes which would have been sealed but for the aid of railways, powerful and consolidated, able to do what would have been impossible by weak, isolated, and helpless corporations. There is no instance where the consolidation—that is to say, the strengthening—of the railway has not been of benefit to the people. There is no reason to suppose that the Reading consolidation will be an exception to the unbroken law and be inimical to the people. While it is true that the anthracite-coal traffic is an element of great importance, it must be remembered that it is only an incident in the problems of the Reading road. The company has other interests than anthracite coal. If its policy contemplates a permanent system, the becoming a part of the structure of our national welfare, it must accept the fact that anthracite coal is a tem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

porary and diminishing value, that it will last our time and perhaps two or three generations more, but that other agencies must be cultivated for the fulfilment of its work. A large proportion of its tonnage is anthracite coal, and will be for a long time. It is by no means the major part, and the proportion in the general volume of its business will lessen from year to year. The Reading railway will carry coal as it carries wheat and sugar and oil, but it is not upon the coal traffic that the future of the system depends.

There are many discussions as to the mistakes made in the capitalization of the various companies in the Reading system, the wisdom of purchases of what might be called dormant properties in past years, and the financial burdens involved in the necessity of holding them for development. These discussions do not apply to the present Reading management. It is in the presence of conditions which it did not create and which it is striving to strengthen and amend by every agency known to a prudent business direction of affairs. The Reading management is charged so to govern its properties that obligations shall be met and the rights of investors assured. This, as experience shows, cannot be done by abandoning one interest to suit the whim of another. It can only be continued with due regard to the rights of all. In the management of the coal supply, it is done first by terminating the squandering methods under which such a large percentage of mining has been sheer waste. It will be done by the prevention of spasmodic production and the ignoring of the laws of supply and demand, which in coal as in everything else is sure to bring improvidence. This will prevent the inadequacy of prices, and while maintaining the investors' rights, assure steady and well-paid work.

Over-production has ever been the bane of all industry. The recurring periods of ruin and depression which have swept over the country have been invariably accompanied by the continued production of some important article of commerce beyond the requirements of the market, whether of cotton and corn, the products of the soil, or of the iron and copper and silver from our mines. The same inexorable law applies to anthracite coal. Nature has imposed peculiar and unusual limitations upon the production and consumption of anthracite. These limitations govern and control both supply and demand, and must be recognized, either willingly or unwillingly, by all concerned. For a brief season in each year the requirements of the markets of the country absorb for consumption upward of four millions of tons per month for a few months, or at the aggregate rate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of about fifty millions of tons per annum; whereas the aggregate consumption scarcely exceeds the rate of forty millions of tons per year. To supply the extraordinary demands of the fall season, the great producing companies have developed a capacity for production equal to the supply required at times of the greatest activity; but it is obvious that if the production should be continued, regardless of the demand, at the rate of the full capacity of all the mines, it would not be long before all the evils of disastrous over-production which I have pointed out would be upon us. The entire storage capacity of the country would fill up and overflow in a month or two, and coal could not be sold for a dollar a ton nor for any price; it could not be given away. This ruin and destruction would stop all mining except in the most favorable localities, throwing every producer into bankruptcy. And enforced cessation of mining would soon produce the real stringency which would advance the price of coal to exorbitant rates for the benefit of the few who might be able to withstand the flood of disaster, and the hope of relief would surely be a vain one, since the experiences of the past fifteen or twenty years would forbid new capital from investment in the hazardous business of mining.

The enormous development of the mining capacity of the anthracite regions and the millions of capital invested in the mines to enable them to produce coal at the highest rate required by the market forbid that they should lie idle for a moment at any time when the product can be sold at a moderate profit. The interest account accumulates too rapidly upon these enormous investments to allow the producers to wait, even if they were so inclined, for an unnatural market stimulated by a short supply. There always has been and must continue to be a supply of mined coal in excess of the immediate demand, except perhaps occasionally for very short periods of particular sizes. I have not alluded to the competition of bituminous coal which is present everywhere, but if there were no other reasons, its presence in every market operates as a prohibition upon any unreasonable advance in the price of anthracite coal, even if the power and disposition to make such an advance existed, which is impossible under any condition of things. To conclude on this point, it is safe to say that the peculiar and unusual limitations which nature has imposed upon the production and consumption of anthracite coal are likely to forbid the folly of over-production, with its train of disaster, on the one hand, and will certainly prevent any attempt, on the other hand, to advance the price of anthracite coal beyond the point of a reasonable profit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Upon one other point I think a word may be profitably added. In the development and augmentation of local industries along its lines lies the path of prosperity for the future railway system. The concentration of the industries of the country in and about the large centres of population has been largely brought about by the establishment of inadequate rates for transportation at competitive points and the maintenance of proportionately high rates at local interior points which became necessary to preserve a sufficient average revenue to support the transportation system of the country. The time has now arrived when the material reduction of what are called through competitive rates has reached its limit, and the competition of the future will be, not the competition of the railroads among themselves for the same traffic, but the competition of the communities along the several lines of railroad with other communities along other lines for the markets of the country; and that community which not served by lines of railroad reaching all parts of the country, at rates commensurate with those enjoyed by other communities on other lines, must fall behind in the race for progress, and the railroad which serves it must follow in their wake. Perceiving its duty to the communities upon whose prosperity its own depends, the management of the Reading railway has sought to equip it with all the means for entering upon the broader field of competition which the future is sure to open; and in doing so, it has not overlooked the necessity of acquiring access to all the sources of supply which enter into the industries along its lines and to the markets to which their products must be carried.

Finally, to rescue the reading management from complications which we have accepted but not created, to give the Reading system its standing among the natural necessary transportation systems of the Middle States, to make the road an element of strength to every national and local interest, industrial as well as financial, is the underlying thought of those who consummated the Reading leases. Experience thus far confirms the wisdom and equity of that transaction; and when it is understood in all its relations and ramifications and seen likewise in the light of experience, there is no apprehension as to the reasonable and discerning judgment of the country.

A. A. McLeod.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A GLANCE AT THE EUROPEAN ARMIES.

OVER eighteen millions of men trained to arms stand ready for battle in Europe. The labor of the highest intellects is diverted from better channels to the details of war. National economics is no longer the single, if difficult, study of yore. It is complicated with a problem awful in its intensity. The noblest work of the world, from the philosophical or the humanitarian standpoint, is perverted to ignoble uses. A world in arms seems to enforce the truth of Martin Luther's odd dictum: "*Der Krieg ist an sich selbst etwas Göttliches, da er ein Weltgesetz ist.*"[1] In the past, war has in truth been the great civilizer; but it should to-day yield its province to education. War has been an incentive to progress; it now clogs its wheels. "*Die Waffen nieder!*"[2] is no idle cry. If disarmament does not come by some process of arbitration now only dreamed of, it must come by starvation or by a cataclysm. Civilization marches fast, and in quite other channels than it used to do; war is now but its ally. We are approaching the time when the Geneva arbitration will become a leaven to the political kneading of the Continent. It was a difficult first step, even between peoples of the same blood; among the diverse tongues of Europe such a triumph of civilized common-sense is not yet possible. But the seed is sown, and the harvest, though not at hand, will be gathered in due time. Even Moltke, the great apostle of war, confessed to faith in eventual rarely-interrupted peace.

Meanwhile to what are these eighteen million soldiers looking forward? Europe has never been so perfectly prepared for war; nor, curiously, has she ever seen a time when soldiers were more loath to fight. There exists a marked and universal dread of war, coupled with an unexampled ability to wage it. Not that there is a lack of stomach; the *morale* of the leading armies is of the best. But Europe stands aghast at her own weapons. War is *quasi*-suicide; and Europe gazes at the blade she holds against her vitals and shrinks from the thrust. The dread is born of the certainty that a war will be a general one, of the uncertainty of its issue. Even France, despite her

[1] "There is something holy in the very nature of war, for it is a law of the universe."

[2] "Down with arms!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unquenched thirst for revenge, will do nothing to provoke war. But an accident, the foolish demonstration of a mob in Paris or the ill-considered utterance of the German *Kaiser*, may precipitate war at any moment. Can we gauge the chances of any of the probable combatants?

There are twenty countries contributing to the eighteen millions of troops. Of these, two antagonistic groups monopolize the situation. In the centre of the Continent stands the German colossus, with its allies, Austria-Hungary and Italy. On either hand are France and Russia, a political Scylla and Charybdis between which the bark freighted with European peace must be steered. Possessing all they can properly claim, the members of the Triple Alliance are directly interested in steadying the helm, while France yearns for her old boundary and Russia proposes—when the time is ripe—to seize the Golden Horn. The lesser powers, in case of war, can complicate the situation by joining either the Double or the Triple Alliance; but immediate danger lurks in the statecraft—one might say simply craft—of the five powers named. England, by the necessity of maintaining her supremacy in the Mediterranean, is drawn to closer relations with Italy. She looks askance at the encroachments in Africa of France and dreads the influence in Asia of Russia. The key of the situation has been thrust upon her. The substantial powers of Europe are three or four against two, in case of a general war. What are their relative abilities?

England stands by herself in not having adopted the rule of universal service. While still ruling the waves so long as there is no combination against her, Britannia cannot claim to be a military power. She alone takes herself seriously as such. Since the Napoleonic struggle she has had no war which has taxed her stanchness to the utmost, and this is the only test of military force. In view of the gigantic proportions of our rebellion and of the Franco-Prussian war, is it not droll to see her "point with pride" to such pigmy operations as the Abyssinian, Ashantee, Zulu, Transvaal, Afghanistan, or Egyptian campaigns? Yet to the average Englishman these are clad with more splendor than the wars of the giants. This self-gratulation is much of a piece with the Balaclava incident, which poetry has placed at the head of all feats of arms. But however gallant that ride into the jaws of death, its prosaic statistics show that the loss in killed and wounded was less than 37 per cent, whereas more than sixty regiments during our Civil War lost in some one engagement over 50 per cent, one 82 per cent; yet few men have even heard of this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact. In like manner our Indian campaigns sink into oblivion unwept, unhonored, and unsung; but in this fight for civilization American heroism has been illustrated by a warfare more constant, more bloody, and more exhausting than any of England's campaigns for well on to eighty years. We are called and perhaps are a boastful people; but has not our cousin across the water retained a yet larger slice of this true Anglo-Saxon inheritance? No one doubts that the English have kept intact the true mettle of our forefathers, nor that, when called on, the response will come promptly and in ample measure; but it has lain dormant so many decades that military pretensions on their part naturally provoke a smile on the Continent among peoples who know what the bitterness of war means, while Americans of this generation may fairly assert that we have proved our claim to military stanchness as they have not. It is for this reason that we look with more respect on the utterances of German critics, who, with their habit of war, study and understand our difficulties and methods as the Briton is incapable of doing.

England has no army to-day in the sense of that word in Europe. She can have none on a system of voluntary enlistment. When the commander-in-chief doubts her ability to mobilize quickly one army corps; when officers of high rank and command testify before a Parliamentary committee that there is not a single effective infantry battalion at home, that no regiment of the First Army Corps could be sent on service, that 50 per cent of the men at Aldershot are not fit to do a day's duty even in England, that not 30 per cent of the rank and file are equal to more than a two-hours' sentry-go; when militia regiments out on manœuvre refuse to sleep in tents as being too severe an exposure—what is there left to say? The recruit of to-day is not the time-honored Tommy Atkins. Out of 61,000 men who presented themselves for enlistment in 1887, over 33,000 were rejected for unsoundness or dismissed for vice. Medical experts declare the clothing, rations, barracks, and habits incompatible with vigorous health. The last decade repeatedly proved England's management of even a small army to be of the poorest, and her active service among savages is the worst of training for civilized war. It would really tax England to mobilize two army corps, say 50,000 men, and one cavalry division with anything like Continental speed. Except as an ally who could make herself useful by landing a body of men on the enemy's coast as an opportune diversion, England is of positively no weight so far as her army is concerned. All this is said without for a moment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forgetting Crécy and Agincourt, Malflaquet and Waterloo, with a faith, religious in its intensity, in the grit and honor of Old England.

On the sea it is otherwise. The British fleet is, despite the many errors which rapid advance in technical matters make unavoidable, the best afloat. But the other powers have not been idle. France possesses on her Atlantic shore and in the Mediterranean a powerful navy. By deepening the *Canal du Midi* she will be able to transfer quickly from one squadron to the other, while England must sail the long course through the Straits of Gibraltar; and her naval station at Biserta will be a threat to the road to India. France will before long be all but as strong in the Mediterranean as England with Gibraltar, Malta, Port Said, and Cyprus. Small wonder that England leans toward an *entente cordiale* with Italy.

The gravest danger to England's position as a great power is not in Europe. It may be difficult for her to keep out of the next war, for France views with alarm her occupation of Egypt, yet redolent with the elder Napoleon's lustre; but this is a minor matter. It is in Russia's restless pushing across the great Aryan plateau toward the confines of the Indian empire that lurks the nearest peril. The Orientals have a cognate liking for Russia; they understand the stable autocracy of the czar; but a change in the British ministry is always an enigma. Were it not for the wonderful personal force of many English officials in the East, England could not long retain her prestige in rivalry with the insinuating policy of Russia. Since Turkestan fell under Russia's sway, Bokhara, Khiva, Kokhand, Merv, have slowly but surely followed. Just when Russia will feel strong enough to make an actual bid for control dangerous to England's holding in India depends upon many contingencies. But she can at almost any moment advance along the line Herat–Kandahar with a force sufficient to prevent England from interfering too seriously with her Bosphorus projects. By fortifying Quetta, England shows that she fears this. It seems as if Great Britain must side with the Triple Alliance and against France and Russia.

The aspirations of Russia in Europe extend only to the Balkan Peninsula. She cares little for the politics which sway the other powers. Her destiny pushes her toward a Mediterranean outlet for her potential commerce and toward the control of inner Asia. In whichever direction she can the more safely tread at any given time will be her path. She does not seek war, but she will not rest from encroachment. Her next step in Asia will be to control Persia, or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she may attack the Turkish problem from Asia Minor. Russia is active in the Baltic, though in case of war the more mobile and active German fleet could probably neutralize hers. In the Black Sea she is not doing so much. As fearless of conquest as the United States, she is more troubled by her present finances than by fears of her future growth. She can bide her time, certain that she will gain ground to the south and east. But that a war which appealed to the restless element might quiet her internal politics does not make for peace.

Russia is rich in material for an army, since eight years ago she fell into line by adopting universal service. The material has excellent physical qualities, but it lacks intelligence. The Russian soldier has always been a dangerous opponent; Kunersdorf and Borodino tell a story of undaunted heroism. Brave, of wonderful endurance, uncomplaining, easily subjected to discipline, requiring little, he has been a pattern soldier. But to-day, when the intelligence of the enlisted man is so marked a factor in the efficiency of an army, it is a query whether the Russian can hold his own in Europe; for 73 per cent of the army in Europe can neither read nor write, of that in Asia, 82 per cent. The minor officers are, moreover, of low grade, a fact scarcely compatible with efficiency. The Russian army has always been proud of its ability to stand hammering at close quarters; but this is not of the essence of modern war—when actual annihilation may follow a false manœuvre. It is the intelligent initiative that keeps out of false positions which is demanded.

In a general European war the *rôle* of Russia, *quoad* Germany and Austria, is a defensive one, though she may look upon a sharp offensive as the best defence. Her true line of defence against Germany is the Vistula, which she would seek to hold. As against Austria, she would probably advance into Galicia from the Polish salient. She has been fortifying of late years; but Russia knows enough not to depend on an inert line of strong places. She will put all her energy into active operations. Yet, despite some war-at-any-cost men who believe that, successful or not, it would increase the quota of the liberties they aspire to, Russia does not desire war. She will not have completed her new organization for two years. The lack of breadstuffs this year would seriously hamper her mobilization, though she has been moving troops to the westward. Some Hotspurs talk of huge cavalry raids into German territory like those of our Civil War, forgetful that our raids were made through a sparsely settled country, while eastern Germany is full of material which would quickly arrest a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cavalry column of any size or destroy it if it penetrated too far. In other words, Russia is not prepared, and without some peculiar incitement will not venture on war this year. Far better for her quietly to increase her already growing influence in Afghanistan. That there are difficulties in the way of actual conquest too near India, mainly logistic, is undeniable; but Russia uses true Oriental means, as do not the English. Samarkand is becoming Russianized; Peshawer is not a whit more English.

Russia's threat to India is a strong card. Great Britain must hold India, if only as a place for stray investments of men and money and as a means of keeping her trade-standing in the East. Nor is the threat an idle one. Russia now has steam communication across the Caspian with Samarkand and a respectable force *echeloned* along the way back to her reserves. Probably one hundred thousand men could be massed on the Afghan frontier in three months. England acknowledges that Russia in Afghanistan would lead to intolerable complications; with the czar's hand on Herat, the empress' influence over India would be forfeited; but as most of the troops now in India are urgently needed there, it is not probable that, as at present situated, England could put more than sixty thousand men along the Cabool-Guzni-Kandahar or the Peshawer-Quetta defensive lines; and to resort to a defence of her great subject empire along the Indus, however militarily sound in placing all the logistic difficulties on the enemy, cannot be thought of for a moment in view of its political hazard. India must be defended in Afghanistan. To sum up the case in the East, it is moral influence which will tell, and in this Russia is apparently gaining while England is not. This question bears more weight in European politics than at first blush appears.

The French army has never been in so prime a condition as it now is. Napoleon's, as an army, was at no time as sound throughout. It can pass almost any test. Even the best German authorities acknowledge this. "*Frankreich steht mit uns in den Waffen gleich*,"[1] says General von Leszczynsky. Sir Charles Dilke's summary of the French armies goes too far—not in actual, but in comparative praise. The French army is not the best in Europe. It is highly commended when put on the same level as the German. There are still some serious points of criticism. The spirit which animates the army is the same as that which produces the restless ambition of the leaders and the changeableness of the people. Jealousies with many attendant evils

[1] "France stands on an equality with us in military strength."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come frequently to the surface. There is lacking the quiet pose of subordination to one central autocratic permanent power for which discipline, however severe, will not make up. No man is more patriotic than the Gaul; but his patriotism is of a different order from the *Vaterlandsliebe* of the Teuton. No more splendid example of patient, intelligent, consistent work than the recent reorganization of the French army adorns the pages of history. The infantry is excellent, the artillery of the best, and the two arms work admirably together—the most important of modern demands. The cavalry did not show its capacity in the last manœuvres, but it is well mounted and taught. The engineers did remarkable work; the telegraph and telephone service was perfect; the balloon corps promised results; the train management was not to be criticised. But there was no attempt to combine the workings of the three arms, nor was the cavalry used in its proper *rôle*.

The manœuvres were none the less useful. The beauty of the evolutions of troops on parade has ceased to be a test of any value. Discipline as it used to be understood must be supplanted by clear-headedness and a power to act intelligently. Good education in petty officers is far more valuable than ramrod precision of drill or set-up. That the French have gained in the right direction was demonstrated by their manœuvres. What has always made the French army is leadership, and however highly we may gauge the French generals, which of them has demonstrated his being abreast of the difficult problems of modern war? This is everywhere the one treacherous factor in the problem. In 1870 there was a ruling mind in the European armies; there is no man of preëminent parts to-day. And yet above the individual excellence of the several armies, above every other consideration, there is demanded sound strategical and tactical management. Whoever can guess where reside the highest qualities in the leaders may safely predict the outcome of the next war. But where is the seer? To all appearances the military talent of France is of a high order. Whoever raised the French army from the wreck of the last war has incontestable ability. But is it of the order which can command as well as organize?

The 1891 manœuvres in France proved the marching ability of the men, the excellence of their armament and equipment, the efficiency of the staff corps and adjunct arms. But can a set of manœuvres, planned out on paper and studied for months before their execution, give the troops or their leaders any training for the kaleidoscopic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changes of actual war? There were confessedly a number of absurd errors and impossible evolutions—bodies of troops boldly marched over ground where they would have been annihilated by the enemy's massed batteries. All this is natural enough and proves nothing, as, indeed, the manœuvres themselves only proved certain excellences without demonstrating the fitness of the troops and leaders for active operations. The troops were really better than the handling. The value of these great manœuvres end when the rival bodies reach fighting contact, so soon as they are deployed for battle. It is here, however, that for the ordinary spectator their interest begins; and the French dearly love the dramatic. You may learn something from the strategic work; the tactical cannot be so carried through as to demonstrate anything. The manœuvres should be for use, not show, though no doubt the self-confidence of the French army has been heightened by them.

Strategy for many ages aimed at the avoidance of battle. It now aims at immediate conflict. To keep a million men at work and in food is too difficult a problem to be long drawn out. Put every man you can mobilize on the frontier; seek your enemy at once; compromise him by quick and skilful movements; beat him; cut off his retreat. Tactics is proportionately growing in value, and hence the individual ability of troops. The substantial equality of equal masses is no longer to be counted on, but numbers still tell. With the greater similarity in arms, discipline, and condition, whoever keeps his forces in hand, simplifies his manœuvres, is speedy in utilizing his tactical advantages on the battle-field, and then strikes with all his might will win. The French manœuvres could be no training for this.

Despite excellent preparation, the French are not eager for war. "*Revanche*" is not now as keen-scented a cry as it was ten years ago. Though his spurs are sharper, the Gallic cock's crow is less shrill. France recognizes the uncertainties of the situation, and though in better financial condition than Germany, is not going to war for a shadow. At an opening which promised success, however, she would immediately thrust. It is wiser for France not to strike for Alsace and Lorraine too soon; better use her means in developing her enormous African colonies and protectorates by the trans-Saharan railway. By and by she will be proportionately stronger than she now is. If her government remains stable, she will gain by every year's delay.

If the status of France is difficult to determine, that of Germany is a very maze. Those who in 1870 knew Prussia well had no doubt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as to the issue of a war with France, though no one expected a walk-over. The case to-day is different. The German army is not the superior of the French. Whoever estimates at their true value the homogeneous organization, the diligence, and the subordination of self to the general result which have always characterized the Germans, may cast his vote in their favor. But it is a narrow choice. The next war will call out national individualities. According as each views the qualities of the Teuton or the Gaul, each may divine results. Some conditions are to be noted. So long as an army is a despotic body, so long will service due to a single chief, which cannot be complicated by professional intrigues, be the better rendered. In the German army officers are put where they can do the work they are best fitted for. This is not always possible in France. The discipline of the French army is more severe; the training of the German is superior, and individual training is worth more in the field than severity. The latter work harder and more hours; they will go into a campaign more seasoned. All Germans work together; nation and army are interchangeable terms. Manœuvres lately introduced into France and Russia are a generation old in Prussia. The knowledge and individual initiative of the German officers of all ranks are higher than those which any body of military men has ever had; and they believe in and rely on the exceptional intelligence which permeates the ranks. That despite their penury the quality of the German officers does not slacken, speaks well. The Germans will bear up under initial disaster; a first defeat might dishearten the French—it might work a change in their commanders or even affect the government, a result which could not follow in Germany. Assuming that the armies are equal, it is method and race characteristics which will yield superiority. That army which has the best *morale*, other things being equal, will win. What may be said about the Germans in no wise detracts from the value of their opponents. No army can possess more *esprit de corps* than the French, nor be sounder through and through. And keen military observers have more than once expressed their preference for the present military status of *la belle France*.

There are other dangers to Germany. She preserves her peaceful but resolute bearing under a serious financial and political handicap. She has a low treasury in proportion to her armament; the two-year-service law may prove a blunder; her people are ground down by taxes, cheerfully borne by the patriotic majority but galling none the less; trade is far from good. Worse than this, the people, loving and re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

specting the Hohenzollerns, are struggling with hearty purpose to keep from blemish the time-honored cry, "For God, King and Fatherland," while striving to hide and protesting with inward bitterness against the mediæval *dicta* of an immature would-be autocrat. These are beginning to work evil. Saxony, Wurtemberg, Bavaria, will not stand dictation, and the *Einheitlichkeit* of the German army is a *sine qua non* of continued Prussian hegemony, indeed of German safety. Already jealousies of "Prussian particularism" can be traced in the imperial structure. So far there is no question of the unity of command, but such questions are serious during a critical state of tension. A continuation of the emperor's course might provoke what would result in greater eventual liberties, but a disturbance of German homogeneity is fraught with danger greater than the gain.

I have conversed with hundreds of military men of every nationality in Europe since the year opened; I have found not one who did not shrink from war. Each seemed to have in mind what Vater Fritz once said: "*Der Schritt, einen Krieg zu unternehmen, ist so schwer und wichtig, dass es unbegreiflich ist, wie so viele Könige sich dazu so leicht entschliessen können. Ich bin versichert, wenn die Monarchen ein wahres und treues Bild des Elends sehen sollten, in welches eine einzige Kriegserklärung die Völker stürzt, nimmermehr könnten sie dagegen gleichgültig sein.*" [1] This was the real Frederick, who wanted not war, but would fight to the bitter end for what he deemed his rights. So now with all thinking soldiers. Never has warfare promised to be so terrible, so uncertain in its terrors.

Progress in warlike ability is to a certain extent retrogression. Bows and arrows lent equality to our savage ancestors; gunpowder modified hand-to-hand fighting, but none the less left a condition where relative forces could be estimated; modern science upsets all calculations. It thrusts its lever under and upheaves our religious tenets; it makes capital an ephemeral thing by multiplying means of production; it drives out a new fighting equipment every decade; it invents awful means of destruction, only to devise more formidable methods of resistance. It is all "bubble, bubble, toil and trouble." The penetration of new arms of precision may perchance be met by a new metal; smokeless powder suggests covering troops by smoke artificially

[1] To wage war is so serious and weighty a matter that it is inconceivable how so many kings can undertake it so thoughtlessly. I am convinced that if monarchs had a true idea of the misery in which a mere declaration of war plunges a people, they could never be so indifferent to it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

produced; ships are so heavily loaded with armor that they barely float; ordnance lives but a few rounds or tears itself from its emplacement. Uncertainty is universal. The men who have proved their capacity are dead or in the sere and yellow leaf; by success or failure alone can the qualities of the present leaders be gauged. Leadership is preëminently necessary, for strategy is immutable; business talent of the highest order, backed by untold moneys, is called for to move and feed an army of a million men, and becomes harder to get every year; tactics is changed by every new invention. But a single factor remains—the personal equation—and it is tactics which depends on the personal equation; the troops longest kept in heart are the best. Early-morning courage has peculiar value. Where does it most reside?

Germany can less afford a war than France. The receipt of a heavy indemnity does not foot expenditures; to pay one would grind her to powder. But she is ready. Her military standing is what it has always been. Her strategic railways to and along the French frontier are completed; to the Russian frontier Germany has ten and will soon have fourteen lines open, to but five of Russia's. She can mobilize in such a manner as to put in every armed man at the first call—which is the modern idea. The *fin-de-siècle* army is all but the migration of a people; even the "reserves" are now a part of the army in first line. But Germany is trammelled by the loss or shelving of her great men. She does not know when the *Kaiser* may fail her. All this is recognized, if not openly spoken, in Germany. The danger is omnipresent, so that a careless word of his may precipitate a misunderstanding which cannot be smoothed over. Germany is strong and self-confident; that she has a perfect army and the best average of officers, lesser and greater, is believed by many. But she no longer stands at the head of Europe. As with Napoleon toward the close of his career, her enemies have learned her method.

The Triple Alliance is strong. Austria has made a great gain in her military status. Professional pride is higher, instruction is more diligent, discipline and *morale* are excellent, and the armament better than it has been. The intelligence of the troops is not as high as in Germany, but decidedly higher than in Russia. Her interests are identical with Germany's, but she fears no attack except from Russia, while Germany may have to meet Russia and France. Though with but half her force, Austria ought to be able to hold head against a Russian attack, especially as Roumania can lend a hand and keep at least two Russian army corps idle. Austria can more quickly mo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bilize, and is well placed strategically. She is strong in some arms. The cavalry and field artillery are all but the equal of Germany's; her infantry force is, however, on the whole, inferior of that of any of the greater powers. Her officers are poorly paid, and though the cadet school is gaining, are not so able as the French or German; and the non-commissioned officers are of lower grade. Little is done to make the soldier's life attractive or honorable. His pay, rations, and clothing are all poor, and the instruction cannot be called good. But a marked improvement is being scored every year. The magazine rifle and smokeless powder will do wonders, and the new equipment is lighter and better adapted to modern requirements. There has been added to the army-trains a system of portable railways which can be quickly laid along otherwise poor roads for the transport of army material, a thing important in southeastern Europe; and field telegraphy is now part of the staff equipment. To fend off Russia's attack, Galicia has been strongly fortified and garrisoned, but it has an open frontier. Nothing short of the Carpathian Mountains could well arrest a pronounced onset; but Austria could no doubt confine the early campaign to the lowlands of Galicia, which would act as a bumper for the nonce, while the second line was coming up.

The value of Italy in the Triple Alliance is that she holds in check all the French forces which lie in the districts of Lyons, Marseilles, and Nice, as well as the Alpine divisions. To have Italy join with Germany and Austria was imperative. The three are scarcely stronger than France and Russia. Indeed, France believes that as Germany must put up against Russia, on account of her naturally open frontier, a much larger force than France need put up against Italy, she can largely outnumber her old opponent with the sixteen army corps she proposes to unleash in the Vosges region on the first cry of war. Italy adds no inconsiderable strength to the Triple Alliance, though despite severe economy she is financially bankrupt. Her army is very big on paper—a war strength of 2,700,000 men. But she cannot mobilize more than a portion of this force. Her coast lays her open to sudden and disastrous descents, and her length makes mobilization slow, despite the three railways running up and down the peninsula. France could put a large force on the Po before Italy could meet it. In twelve days several French corps could be at the defile of Stradella, while it would take Italy over twenty days to meet them. Such a movement is, however, highly improbable. France is led to expend her energy against Germany by every reason of pride and safety.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy will not invade French territory; Germany will sweep over it as in 1870, unless France is on hand in overwhelming force.

The Italian army is fair. The men are notably brave; they are held under severe discipline and respond to it well; but that the individuality of the men can be relied on has been doubted by many Italian officers of good judgment. Some *élite* corps, such as the *bersaglieri*, are of the best. The new regulations are liberal, possibly too much so. They follow the new idea of leaving more to the intelligence and initiative of the officers and men. How the Italian regiments will respond to this remains to be seen. It is not probable that so much will be required of them as of the troops of their northern allies. The *bersaglieri* are not a fair sample of the whole, but the infantry of the line may do better than is anticipated. Italy's large and excellent fleet to-day is of greater importance than her army, however numerous; and when her new naval station in the island of Magdalena is completed, she will have still more to say as to the situation in the Mediterranean. Her fleet weighs heavier in the balance than it is usually understood to do.

It is, then, a question of France and Russia on exterior lines against Germany, Austria, and Italy on interior ones. And happily the powers holding interior lines most desire peace. There is some doubt as to whether Russia will join France in a fight for mere revenge. The Alsace-Lorraine question has no importance for Russia, said Prince Gortchakoff long ago, and the policy of Russia is not noted for unselfishness. The most important question is what England will do. All her leanings are, it would seem, to the side of the Triple Alliance. What could induce her to side with France, the increase of whose fleet is a disturbing element, if not a subject of fear, it is hard to say; and as to Russia, England can be counted as certainly on the other side. England's neutrality would leave the scales very evenly balanced between the rival alliances; England's casting in her lot with the Triple Alliance would make this the stronger and tend toward peace, which England has also every motive to desire. Germany would like to feel herself abreast of the situation with England neutral, but she manifestly feels its doubtfulness as never before.

The part which other powers may play in the next European war is problematical. The Turkish question may become prominent through the act of Russia; otherwise the army of the sultan will remain innocuous. The Turks are in their way good soldiers. A youth is sent into the ranks in time of war with the inspiriting parental in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

junction, "May Allah make thee a martyr!" instead of, "May God preserve thee!" But though the Turk is fiery in a charge, he is not stable. Despite marked improvement over the last generation, the army is still ill-armed, ill-clothed, ill-equipped, and ill-fed; the pay is always in arrears or largely eaten up in the way of *bakshish* by those in authority, and the patient follower of the crescent can scarcely be called intelligent. The fatalism of the Turk will not take the place of instruction. It is not many years ago since some officers of high rank could not read or write, that there was in the sultan's *entourage* only one officer who could correspond in French. Lack of education keeps down the status of an army, but the green flag is still capable of evoking good work. Until of late there has been no Turkish cavalry. Now two light cavalry corps have been raised in Kurdestan, and more are on the carpet. These will be much what the Cossacks are to Russia, and will help to stave off the czar's operations toward the Golden Horn from Asia Minor.

While the other European armies number many army corps, they do not count for much in to-day's situation. As capable a military expert as exists in Europe, General von Leszczynski, draws from the situation no war-cloud for 1892. There is a smouldering of the fire which may unfortunately be fanned into flame by some untoward accident, but the sensible, usually the governing men of every great power are universally opposed to war, for every reason, political and financial. "*Pacem volo, bellum paro*" is the motto, now more full of meaning than ever. The relative strength of the several nations is gauged by the number of well-trained men each can quickest put into first line. "*Se multiplier par la vitesse*" is the method of to-day. The greatest capacity to do this resides in France and Germany. I am still inclined to yield the palm to the latter, though the scales hang very even between the two, and the peace estimate of France is $1\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of the population as against 1 per cent in Germany. The best hope for peace lies in the fact that Germany unquestionably desires peace; France, though still smarting, does not welcome war, and Russia is scarcely ready. The Anglo-Russian situation may be the first to provoke it, but a European conflict seems improbable just now.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUSSIA'S LAND SYSTEM: THE CAUSE OF THE FAMINE.

I WAS unexpectedly brought into contact with the present condition of the Russian peasants through the movement for the relief of the famine-stricken which was inaugurated by the "Northwestern Miller," published in Minneapolis, and which culminated in the despatch of the steamship Missouri for Russia, laden with a cargo of flour given principally by the millers of the United States. As I represented these donors, it became my duty to superintend the distribution of food, and in the discharge of this duty I gathered impressions as to the cause and probable effects of the famine, partly from what I saw and partly as a result of much discussion with and inquiry among those educated Russians who are to-day laboring diligently to save the people in the famine districts from hunger and death. I may therefore present to the readers of the FORUM one or two phases of the unparalleled calamity which has befallen the peasants in a large portion of Russia, simply giving them as they would present themselves and would become almost self-evident to an American who had reached his conclusions by means of direct observation and the consensus of opinion of those who were living and laboring among the peasants themselves.

In endeavoring to find causes for the present deplorable condition of affairs existing in that portion of Russia commonly known as "the famine district," one almost inevitably concludes, after even a slight examination, that other and more weighty ones than that usually given (the unfavorable weather of last year) are at the bottom of it. The longer the investigation is continued, the firmer grows the impression that fundamentally the system of communal ownership of land is responsible for the situation. The "*mir*"[1] has simply exhausted itself, and the thirty years which have elapsed since the emancipation of the serfs have been more than sufficient to demonstrate that the entire foundation upon which Russian agriculture is based is radically weak, and that the practical result of holding land in common, at least in Russia, is a complete and utter failure. The

[1] A community of Russian peasants in which the land is divided into lots and held in common.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present famine, wide-spread and terrible in its effects, is an ominous object-lesson, proving beyond doubt that the theory of communal land-ownership will not bear the test of practical experience. It has taken thirty years to solve this problem in Russia, and hunger is its answer. The peasant will not intelligently and adequately cultivate land which may pass from his possession into the hands of others after one, two, or at the best a few seasons. On the contrary, he works it for what it will immediately yield, caring little for its future condition, for he does not know how soon the *mir* may allot it to another.

Twenty million nominal property-owners, for such are the famine-stricken peasants, holding in common and clinging tenaciously to large areas of fertile land, fearful above all else of becoming dispossessed of their property interest and of joining an already large and constantly increasing proletariat, yet at the same time begging humbly and piteously for the bare food necessary to maintain existence—this is the strange and anomalous sight which to-day is presented to the world in the naturally arable district lying within the valley of the Volga. That this has come about primarily from the defective system under which the land is held is undoubtedly true. It is also true that the Russian peasant does not cultivate the land thoroughly under any circumstances, that his methods are primitive and his implements mediæval. Still, the force of example might lead him to improve his methods were his individual ambition encouraged by a different system of ownership. Under the present conditions he sees simply as far as the season's work, which practically ends his connection with the land he is tilling.

Fundamentally wrong in its root, the growth of thirty years, which finds its flower in a famine, was hampered and hindered by adverse circumstances too numerous to be referred to here at length. Parasites fastened themselves upon its body and contributed to its decay. The newly-liberated serf, left to himself largely, was free to make his own future, subject, of course, to well-defined limitations; but to the work of development he brought an irresponsible, thriftless, improvident disposition and a naturally good but utterly untrained intellect. He had his hands to himself and his land; he was trained to work, but not to think. Hence the village usurer, the "*koulak*," the "*mir-eater*," found a ready victim for his schemes, and naturally the peasants as a class became subject to the rapacity of money-lenders, petty officials, small traders, and all the varieties of human vermin which in Russia, as in our own country, fatten on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

credulity and the financial ignorance and short-sightedness of those who have the capacity to work, but not the brains to figure.

Even originally the apportionment of land per head was but small, not more than enough to maintain the peasant in the most primitive manner. As the family grew and the sons arrived at maturity, the land belonging to the commune had to be subdivided, so that each might have a share. Thus beyond the discouragement of the system itself and the impoverishment worked upon the peasant by the village usurer and others, the natural reduction of the land which he was permitted to till and enjoy the fruits of, when there were any to enjoy, was great. To-day the peasant, forgetful even of the pangs of hunger and the ravages of pestilence, clamors above all for more land, even though what land he already has is but half-cultivated. It is apparent that the increase in population and consequent reduction in village land *per capita* would, sooner or later, have brought the peasant perilously near to hunger, even if he had been accustomed to modern methods and machinery. Without them, the inevitable result has been hastened. Short crops and partial famines became more and more frequent; the stores, if there existed any, were more continually drawn upon. They reached the danger line, fell below it, and finally became exhausted.

The question of personal liberty aside, the peasant is apparently much worse off than he was before the emancipation. Then, if a landed proprietor wanted money, he did not need to go to a bank in Moscow or St. Petersburg, but could easily borrow it from well-to-do peasants on his own estate. A Moscow gentleman, speaking of this, told the writer that in 1856 his father, wishing to enter into an enterprise requiring cash, easily borrowed from his own peasants 100,000 *rubles* in actual money, in a district where now it would puzzle one to find one-twentieth of this sum, and where constant and unceasing effort is at present being put forth to save the people from absolute starvation. At this juncture in the history of agricultural Russia, when the *mir* seems to have reached an extremity of failure and hopelessness, the attitude of the former landholder and ex-serf-owner toward the distressed people on his estates forms an interesting study, and has a bearing on the situation which may be a most important one. It would appear to a casual observer arguing solely from apparent conditions that through this class, if at all, the future of the peasant can be made more prosperous than his past.

When, in 1861, the Emperor Alexander II. emancipated the serfs,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

giving to each village its due proportion of land and arranging for the payment for it through the government to the former owners, the landed proprietor, generally speaking, found his occupation practically gone. His former dependents made nominally, if not actually, free, he might be excused from further responsibility on their account, and hence he either betook himself to Moscow or St. Petersburg, to enjoy the highest delights that Russian civilization could afford, or wandered over the Continent engaged in study or in the pursuit of pleasure. If he was of an energetic and enterprising character, as might sometimes happen, he perhaps sought other and less purely agricultural portions of his own country, and embarked in various enterprises of a commercial or manufacturing character, wisely using the proceeds of his land in establishing factories or in making other investments likely to yield him future returns. It is doubtful, however, if many of the great landholders took this course, and for the most part they probably entered the service of the government or simply retired to the capital to enjoy life, returning perhaps for a short period during the warm season to the scene of their former power, and more frequently spending their summers in travelling abroad.

The rising generation saw but little of their country homes. Educated elsewhere, they grew up with but slight interest in rural Russia, and came to look upon country life, unless for a few short summer weeks, as an exile from the pleasures to which they had grown accustomed and which they deemed necessary to their very existence. Hence the country house was left more and more to the care of hired custodians, and the parks belonging thereto became more and more neglected. The old rooms were shut up, and for long and gradually increasing intervals the gates were closed upon the actual owner, who was passing his time in more congenial pursuits than the cultivation and care of his greatly reduced estates. How much these estates were lessened may be judged by the example given me by a gentleman who said that at the time of the emancipation his family owned 60,000 *dessiatines* of land (more than 160,000 acres), of which 44,000 *dessiatines* went to the peasants and 16,000 remained in the possession of the family. Thus their estate was reduced from over 160,000 acres to less than 45,000, the greater part of which was unproductive and the rest was partially rented to the peasants. The gentleman quoted had never even visited this particular property until the famine recalled him to his duty.

The overseer or superintendent was deputed to represent the owner

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in handling what property was left and in dealing with the tenants; and the relation existing for so many generations between the landed proprietor and the peasant was interrupted and, generally speaking, broken up. Except on his own estate, the Russian gentleman had no authority. He might make suggestions to and advise the peasant, but he had no power to enforce his suggestions, and the tiller of the soil, being steeped in superstition and quite beyond the reach of reason, became his own judge as to what was best for himself, his family, and his land. In the old days the landed proprietor may have been harsh with his dependents; but he was the natural protector and providence of his people, and, next to the czar, was looked to by them as their legitimate and proper ruler, to whom they appealed in all cases for succor against distress and for justice in disputes. He may not always have been a just and considerate lord, but at least it was unquestionably to his interest to teach the peasant how to get the best from the land and to encourage him in thrift and energy; for the richer the peasant was, the better off was the landowner.

The act of emancipation legally released the landed proprietor from all responsibility as to the condition of the peasants. It was the divorce between the two elements long united, the peasant and his lord. But while kings and emperors can make laws and utter edicts, the changing of old habits, traditions, and customs cannot be done by imperial act. Time alone can alter these, and, as the present situation shows, time has as yet failed to efface the peasant's illogical but natural notion that his landed proprietor or his sons and daughters are the responsible ones to whom he must turn in the hour of danger or distress. Theoretically, the Russian peasant looks to God and the czar to see that he does not starve, but he applies for food to those toward whom he and his forefathers have been wont to look for hundreds of years—those who have taken him into the wars of the past, who have built him his churches, and who represent his immediate and visible providence. I have seen old negroes in the South who, although they were free and supposably independent, yet came to "old marster and missus" when they were hungry, and were given from the meagre stores of a formerly bountiful larder as long as there remained a crust to divide. Quite as illogically, simply, and trustfully has the hungry Russian peasant asked aid from his old and traditional master, and quite as a matter of duty has it been given, even when, as in many cases, the giving of it exhausted the family exchequer and financially ruined the giver.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the cry of his hungry people the Russian landed proprietor was not dumb. He was the first to hear it, and it recalled him at once to the scene of his former existence. Long before the government knew or recognized the situation he was at work among the peasants, and to-day he is standing by them, doing what he can to mitigate their sufferings. Through him the government was informed of the true state of affairs, and through his efforts the peasantry have been carried over this horrible season and given a fighting chance to raise another crop. From nearly every family in Russia of any prominence have members gone forth from their luxurious surroundings to do valiant battle with hunger and disease, to endure hardship and brave even death. That the landed proprietor who has done nothing for his tenants and former serfs is the exception, and not the rule, is clear to any one who may choose to investigate the subject. It is not pleasant to go among the peasants during a time of famine, nor is there any fame awaiting those who have devoted their whole energies to relieving distress. It must be remembered that the claim of the peasant was a moral one only. The landowner is not responsible for the present situation, nor, in the majority of cases, does he receive any income from those he is helping. However, the more fortunate Russian, responsive to the traditionary claim and remembering the ancient relation existing between the two classes, has gone to the help of his distressed brother, and no one will ever know the number who have given fortune and life itself to this cause. Educated men and women have hastened to carry hope and succor into the very fields where hunger and typhus prevail, and they are still devoting their energies and means to this work. The great assistance given by this element is shown very significantly by the fact that in districts where the landed gentry are few and distant from one another the suffering has been worst.

The particular field covered by the landed proprietor, his son or daughter, is where the government relief through the *Zemstvo* leaves off. This includes the care of the very young and the very old, the infirm, the extremely poor, and the sick; and it is unnecessary to say that the field is sufficiently large not only to necessitate the most active and incessant labor on the part of these self-devoted people, but to require as much outside assistance as the charitable world at large can send. This class furnishes the most conscientious and intelligent relief workers now in the field. It understands the peasant and his ways. It can neither be imposed upon by the more menda-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cious nor can it be hoodwinked by official misrepresentation. Its members go independently among the people, doing their work honestly and earnestly. The return of the landed proprietor to his estate and, to some extent at least, to his former responsibilities, the faithful, earnest, self-sacrificing work he and his family are now doing, make the only bright spot in an overcast sky. That, having once returned to look after his former dependents, he may never leave them or quite neglect them, is the hope of all who are true well-wishers of Russia and her peasants.

Perhaps the great famine is, after all, a blessing in disguise, for it is bringing the peasant and his ancient ruler back into their old relations. To one who investigates the condition of the peasantry, it must appear that the only chance for the intelligent handling of the toiler's future lies in the destruction of absenteeism and the return of the landed proprietor, in some measure at least, to his former connection with the peasant. To him alone may, as a rule, the administration of peasant justice be committed. He knows his people and they know him. Better by far is the rule of the ancient proprietors, moderated and curtailed to meet modern requirements, than the government of new and untried petty officials and the impositions of the village usurer.

It is common in Russia to refer to the present condition of the peasant as temporary, the result of a bad harvest, and to express the belief that with favorable weather this year he may recover himself. To one who sees the peasants as they now are, it is difficult to discover anything in their state upon which to base any hope of its speedy amelioration. The present famine is the climax of several predecessors, gradually increasing in intensity and extent until the worst has been reached. There must be partial famines in Russia every year, and this one would have passed as usual had it not been that it marked the very limit of human endurance beyond which was death. The export of grain from Russia does not mean the export of a surplus, but the parting with food needed to sustain life. The present famine has shown the great, hollow void in the very heart of the empire, and as long as the present system is continued, all the favorable weather which Providence can send will be powerless to fill it. The gradual impoverishment of the peasant has been going on for thirty years, and the end has been reached. Poverty can go no farther, for death must ensue unless relief is afforded. As to the next crop, what with lack of seed-wheat, dearth and weakness of horses,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the prevalence of typhus, scurvy, and small-pox among the workers themselves, enfeebled as they are by a year of hunger, the prospect for a large crop is extremely doubtful, at least in the eighteen districts affected by the famine. If the peasants in these sections can grow enough grain to keep them from starving, they will do well indeed. The limit of exportation from the actual means of existence instead of an exportable surplus has been reached and passed. The authorities certainly will not allow a repetition of last year's blunders, and unless all signs fail Russia must, temporarily at least, retire from her artificial position as an exporter of grain and turn the products of her fields into her depleted storehouses. She must give her peasants another start and allow them to accumulate a village reserve. As far as one can judge, this policy seems in line with that of the government.

As for the peasant himself, he has labored long and patiently. He has shown sublime faith and immense endurance. He is loyal to his emperor, still hopeful and trusting, but he is powerless to go on as he has been going; for the end of all his labor, endurance, faith, and patience is only the bread of hunger. At last the whole of Russia seems to have awakened to his unhappy condition, and pity has brought the high and low together. Perhaps this is the lesson of the long, black winter of starvation and the hopeless spring of pestilence, that the rich have discovered the poor and the fortunate have gone to the aid of the wretched. The lord of the land has returned to his former serfs and interested himself in their welfare. It cannot be possible that having once more become acquainted and having learned to know each other's value, these two hitherto widely separated classes can, with the return of a temporarily better condition, become entirely estranged. If so, and the peasant's welfare should be again neglected by his traditional protector, his prospects for the future are dark indeed.

W. C. EDGAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOMAS HARDY AND HIS NOVELS.

THAT the author of "The Return of the Native" has lived to equal if not to surpass that masterpiece is proof of the greatness of his place among contemporary novelists. It is a rank, however, as yet far from being generally conceded, though "Tess of the D'Urbervilles" has apparently done more to bring about a true recognition of the author than the whole range of his writings from the early and anonymous "Desperate Remedies," in 1871, to his "Group of Noble Dames," in 1890. No one can approach English fiction critically and fail to perceive that Thomas Hardy is, at his best, one of the most remarkable novelists whom England has produced; and yet we are confronted by the fact that his popularity, although of steady growth, is altogether disproportionate to his merits, and that even the immense swing by which he has recently been carried to the front place is due in no slight degree to causes independent of the literary quality and value of his work.

First and foremost, Thomas Hardy is a profound realist. I admit that, to me, the realism of Mr. Howells is thin and that of Mr. Henry James superficial compared with that of the author of "Under the Greenwood Tree," "The Return of the Native," "The Woodlanders," and the "Wessex Tales." Again, his robustness of thought and speech does not appeal to most readers. They dislike him as crudely natural, even as they dislike the strong smell of the earth, the reckless by-play and fierce activities of the energies of nature, the salutary rudeness of bleak weather, rain, and the moil of muddy ways. It is possible to conceive of a woman having produced "*Madame Bovary*," but not "*Salammbo*"; of having composed "*Une Page d'Amour*" or even "*La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret*," but not "*Germinal*" or "*La Terre*," even with all its author's intense masculinity, of having written "Diana of the Crossways"; but it is impossible to think of the author of "The Return of the Native" or "Tess of the D'Urbervilles" as a woman. Mr. Hardy is not only the most English of all English writers since Shakespeare, but he is the most essentially masculine, is masculine almost to a fault. The manner of his expression being in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accord with the nature of his genius, his style is unattractive to many, for it has much of the massive serenity, the large air, the austere dignity of nature herself. Of all modern novelists he is, or was till very recently, least read and least appreciated by women. This is strange, as no writer of our time has shown a more profound sense of the charm to men of women as women, a deeper understanding of women's nature, or of the nature of many women, and a more thorough grasp of the enormous influence of woman, through both her strength and her weaknesses, in the economy of human life. But it is, I suspect, and as has already been hinted, not only women in general, but a large section of intellectually effeminate men, who resent this very attitude of Mr. Hardy. "Why cannot he give us a type of flawless womanhood?" is a question I have seen in print and heard used again and again. Alas! the painter of Bathsheba and Eustacia and Tess is not the supreme power.

Over and above this objection, I have noted that many persons of each sex are held at a distance, or even frightened away, by certain essential qualities of Mr. Hardy's genius. It is as inevitable as the pathway of the winds, that are supposed to blow whence and whither they will, or as the tread of the avenger through Greek tragedy. It is as sombre as the aspect of Egdon Heath, while equally alive with sunshine, and fragrance, and the quick pulse of superabundant life. It is as quiet, unobtrusive, and pervasive as the tide, and has, below all the brightness and merry shimmer, the profound melancholy of the ocean. If one were to read sequently this writer's books, from even the earliest to "Tess of the D'Urbervilles," one would gain at last an overwhelming sense of the blind way of destiny, of the pathetic futility of human effort, of the pitiless impartiality of the laws of nature. But Hardy brings home to the reader a sense of profound sadness. Without ever unduly obtruding himself as the theologian or the philosopher, he touches the deepest chords of spiritual life, and having wrought his subtle music therefrom, turns away with a loving, sorrowful regret at all the by-play of existence beneath such dim darkness behind, above, and beyond. Yet to speak of him as a pessimistic writer would be misleading, because inadequate. He does not preach pessimism, for he has the saving grace of having no "ism" to support or exemplify. He is tolerant and patient, seeing at once the good and the weakness in all. In a word, the pessimism of which so many complain is a revelation rather than an exposition. Characteristically enough, it is seldom that he directly writes in a strain of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sadness. Life, movement, humor, the endless play of the forces of nature and her innumerable and ever-changing aspects, afford him more than enough material. It is only now and then that he reveals his intimate sense of the insoluble mystery of existence, of our unguided way across a trackless plain of whose lost frontiers there is no remembrance and whose horizons are seen of none. It is this steadfast austerity which has stood between him and so large a portion of the reading public.

Of less importance than his genuine realism or than his characteristic, if half-obscured irony, but still a noteworthy factor in the matter of Mr. Hardy's acceptance of the public, is his style, or, to be more exact, certain idiosyncrasies of style. Though the most exclusively and natively English of all the great novelists of the Victorian age, he is, in point of diction, the most Latinical writer we have had since Dryden and Milton. This is the characteristic of the Celtic Briton, and not of "the English Englishman." And yet, so far as is known, Mr. Hardy is of Old Saxon or Anglo-Danish stock. In this respect he is to be classed with two other writers who are both markedly given to a strongly Latinized diction—Mr. George Meredith and Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson.

Perhaps one must know something of Wessex in order fully to enjoy Mr. Hardy's novels. Certainly to those familiar with the southwestern counties there is as little exaggerated in his chronicle of the doings and sayings of the natives as in his descriptions of the general and particular features of the countryside, from the mystic barrows beyond Egdon Heath on the north to where, on the south, the Channel waves splash at the feet of the little town "sacred to the memory" of the trumpet-major. Mr. Hardy's own qualities of humor, shrewdness, and quaintness have not led him to pervert the homely speech of the country-folk into a diction impossible or at least improbable; what he has done is to give, for the most part, only the quintessential part of it. In this sense, and this sense only, can he be held to account for straining or overcoloring his material. It is thus, no doubt, that so many of his most careful readers note the Shakespearean quality of so much of his peasant speech, for unquestionably Shakespeare drew his Touchstones and Audreys from life—and the laboring country-folk of the Wessex of to-day differ wondrous little in all essential respects from their ancestors of Elizabethan, Stuart, or Georgian times. Wise words don't come from a fool, in whatever degree of social life he moves; and, *vice versa*, when naturally shrewd

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and vigorous minds express themselves, they do so aptly, whether they be as cultured as Swithin St. Cleeve and Lady Constantine, as "ordinary" as Gabriel Oak or John Loveday, as insignificant socially as Tess Durbeyfield or Marty South or Fancy Day, as "low" as Diggory the reddleman or the forever-perspiring Reuben Dewy. For the most part the Wessex of Mr. Hardy is a land of woodland and pasture, here rising into grassy uplands and even hills, here sinking into long, fertile, verdurous valleys, here dark with the oak and beech leaves of the New Forest, here bare with the vast heaths and moors which give so great a portion of it a character so unlike that of the shires to the north and east. The villages, too, are just as they were in the times of our forefathers.

Mr. Hardy himself resides in the heart of the "five-countied Wessex." His home is a large red-brick house built after his own designs, situated on the rise of a long upland sweep to the east of Dorchester. A vast perspective is before one from almost any of the windows of the house, rolling downs, acres of arable land and pastures, upland ranges, and dark belts of woodland, with, valleyward, the white gleam of the Froom meandering among the dairy lands and through and past ancient Dorchester. Far away to the right is the hill-top monument to his kinsman of old, Admiral Hardy "of glorious renown"; to the southwest are the broken ridges of that extraordinary freak of nature (and toil of man) known as "Maiden Castle." In front of the house itself stretches away an immense swelling meadow, some three thousand acres in extent, the largest in England. I cannot swear to the acreage, but answer for the vaguer statement. The house is known as "Max Gate," the old name of the portion of the upland whereon it is built and of the small hamlet near, though it was at one time the intention of the owner to call his place "Conquer Barrow," after the tree-covered mound which rises to the northeast, just beyond his garden walls. Not only is Mr. Hardy thus in the best position possible for the novelist of Wessex, within easy reach as he is of any part of the whole region brought so vividly near to us in "Under the Greenwood Tree" and "The Woodlanders," in "The Return of the Native" and "Tess of the D'Urbervilles," but he is in what is to him, with his scientific and antiquarian as well as artistic and literary tastes, a profoundly interesting country. Dorchester, itself a great Roman encampment and fortress in the days of Constantine, and the whole region around, are as full of "remains," Roman and Anglo-Saxon, as any locality in western Europe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Among the few features of agricultural England which retain an appearance but little modified by the lapse of centuries may be reckoned the high, grassy, and furzy downs, coombs, or ewe-leases, as they are indifferently called, that fill a large area of certain counties in the south and southwest." So begins the story of "The Three Strangers," in "Wessex Tales." If the Londoner or the visitor to our "province of houses" tire of the inevitable urban hurry and worry, he could not do better than take a leisurely walking-trip among those "high, grassy, and furzy downs, coombs, or ewe-leases." He will find them and the homely, ignorant, yet shrewd and often strikingly intelligent and even original people who dwell by them just as described by Mr. Hardy. He will gain enjoyment and renewed vigor of body, and find that it is not "Continental travel" alone that enlarges the mind. Parochialism is even easier to carry about with one than one's portmanteau. But for those who cannot wayfare into Wessex, let me recommend a mental voyage with Mr. Hardy as guide and companion. One cannot but be the stronger and healthier and saner and every way better for such an experience. To those who already know all he has to tell us, Wessex is a haunted land, to which it is ever a rare pleasure to turn, whether in fact or vicariously. And there is endless company—from such wrecks of man's high estate as Thomas Leaf or Granfer Cantle or Christian to such fine souls or brilliant spirits as Bathsheba Everdene, Eustacia Vye, Marty South, Tess Durbeyfield, Gabriel Oak, John Loveday, or Clym Yeobright. This Wessex of Thomas Hardy is, to the lovers of his work, but another Wilderness Bottom, green and fragrant and winsome, from whose "thickets of dream" comes enchantment as sweet and welcome as that "loud, musical, and liquid voice" which Dick Dewy and Fancy Day heard by the copses on their wedding-eve.

Mr. Hardy was born in Dorset, in 1840. After an education which comprised a good classical and scientific training, though he was at no university, he began life as an architect. He resided in London from 1862 to 1867, from 1870 to 1872, and from 1878 to 1881; for the rest he has lived mostly in Dorset. His comparatively brief sojourns in Italy and France have left almost no trace upon his work. His first printed literary production was an essay on colored brick architecture, written with so much technical knowledge and in so creditable a style that the author was awarded the medal of the "Institute of Architects." Prior to 1870 he wrote, with this exception,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing of any importance, and the most industrious and unprincipled resurrector would be hard pushed to rake up against this author any *juvenilia*, except, perhaps, a signed sketch of a few pages contributed to "Chambers's Magazine" late in the sixties. But in 1870 he decided to see what he could do as a novelist. At this date he recognized neither his true bent in fiction nor the great advantage of the material which since his early boyhood he had unconsciously accumulated. At the same time, both from choice and from instinct, he depicted scenery and delineated types of character more or less familiar to him; and though it would be foolish to claim for his first book any high place in contemporary fiction, it is not to be passed over in the cavalier fashion adopted by many newspaper critics. In the first place, "Desperate Remedies" has originality in more ways than one, an originality more obvious in 1871 than twenty years later, no doubt; in the next, it is of particular importance to every critic of Mr. Hardy's collective work, for in it is much that is suggestive, much that goes to substantiate the statement that from the first a continuous vein of inspiration has sustained the novelist, a vein as clearly recognizable as it is distinctly individual.

In 1872 another novel appeared without the writer's name, though acknowledged to be by the author of "Desperate Remedies." "Under the Greenwood Tree" was subtitled "A Rural Painting of the Dutch School," and here we have at once and unmistakably the hand of a master. To this day "Under the Greenwood Tree" remains one of Mr. Hardy's most distinctive achievements. It seems to me to stand alone as much now as at the time when it appeared. From first to last it is admirable, though it has no plot to speak of, and is, in a word, nothing more than a series of life-like studies of man and nature connected by a thread of narrative. But where can we find its like? When has anything more absolutely English been done? Where, since the time of Shakespeare, do we encounter such vivid fidelity, such Rembrandtesque setting of homely things in the picturesque aspect that is none the less true because seen quintessentially? In his next book Mr. Hardy made a more definite bid for success with the novel-reading public. "A Pair of Blue Eyes" (1873) was a title likely to appeal to the subscribers to circulating-libraries, and as a matter of fact the book had some vogue. Though it has many notable things in it, and as a story is a distinct advance upon any previous tale from the same pen, it is not one of the author's important books. At the same time, Elfride Swancourt is one of Mr. Hardy's most dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinctive creations. It is commonly understood that of all his heroines, she is the least liked by other women. But in "Far from the Madding Crowd" a far wider success was won. This book made its author one of the foremost novelists of his day, and still is the most popular of all his romances. Gabriel Oak and Bathsheba Everdene are now as familiar names in our ears as those of almost any personages in Scott, Thackeray, or Dickens. The whole art of Mr. Hardy can be studied in this novel. No one is at once more vital and more austerely reserved than he; no one more fresh and vigorous and blithely humorous, and yet more profoundly impressed by the tragic pathos and mystery of our "why and wherefore." The pathos, almost invariably unobtrusive, is as native and genuine as the humor. It is of a kind that has no kinship with sentimentality, but is, as it were, the twilight and moonlight of strong, vigorous life. More than once this chronicle of the countryside rises to a high pitch of dramatic intensity. A hint as to the *motif* of the book, as indeed of all Mr. Hardy's work, might be found in that pregnant sentence in one of the early chapters: "Love is a possible strength in an actual weakness."

Fine, however, as is "Far from the Madding Crowd," it is not Thomas Hardy's masterpiece. That was written some four years later. But before the publication in 1878 of "The Return of the Native" there appeared the novel called "The Hand of Ethelberta." Public opinion is still strangely divided about this book. There are readers who think it one of the author's cleverest productions, and there are more who miss in it the particular quality which enhances for them the value of such works as "The Return of the Native," "The Woodlanders," and "Tess of the D'Urbervilles." The first of these three, one of the greatest works of fiction in our time, was by no means hailed at once as a masterpiece, though in this instance the public proved to be wiser than the critics. This story of Clym Yeobright, of Eustacia Vye, of so many others of all degrees from passionate Wildeve and winsome Thomasin and the homely reddleman, Diggory Venn, to Granfer Cantle and Christian, and the heathside company who meet at the "Quiet Woman" inn and elsewhere, is one of the most moving and memorable novels in our language.

"The Trumpet-Major," which chronologically is Mr. Hardy's next book, was for many years and possibly still is a much more popular novel. True, the period dealt with is a more remote one, and the ordinary novel-reader is not apt to give his or her vote for a story wherein the hero is finally left out in the cold; yet the events are of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so stirring a kind and the narrative is so full of vivid and picturesque detail that John Loveday has probably a wider circle of friends than any other of Mr. Hardy's male characters, with the possible exception of Gabriel Oak and Clym Yeobright. If the book has not the tragic intensity of "The Return of the Native," the nervous movement and youthful energy of "Far from the Madding Crowd," the austere impressiveness of "The Woodlanders," or the glow and passionate humanity of "Tess of the D'Urbervilles," it has a serene and welcome charm of its own, the quiet sundown light of a bright autumnal day. As unlike "The Trumpet-Major" as either of its two most notable predecessors are the two volumes which came next, "A Laodicean" in 1881 and "Two on a Tower" in 1882. In my judgment "A Laodicean" is the least successful of all Mr. Hardy's novels. It seems even to lack vitality. "Two on a Tower," on the other hand, is alive from first to last, and though not in what may be called Mr. Hardy's permanent manner, it is a novel of singular wit, charm, skill, and grace. Yet even here the best things are said by "the common chorus," and probably as many readers enjoy the remarks of Hezekiah Biles, Sammy Blore, Nat Chapman, and Haymoss Fry, as of Lady Constantine and Swithin St. Cleeve.

Four years elapsed between the publication of "Two on a Tower" and "The Mayor of Casterbridge," though in this period were written two or three of the remarkable short stories which later on were issued under the collective title "Wessex Tales." "The Mayor of Casterbridge" is, I have heard, looked upon by booksellers as the least popular of Mr. Hardy's books. It is not quite easy to understand this. Certainly it is not so well constructed and is in a sober tone throughout, and, what perhaps signifies much, there is less humor in it than in most of the other chronicles of country life in Wessex. On the other hand, Michael Henchard, the mayor, is one of Mr. Hardy's most noteworthy creations.

In the "Wessex Tales," again, we find the same qualities which have assured the success of "Far from the Madding Crowd" and its kindred. These stories are admirable, and in vigor, picturesqueness, humor, and potent charm seem to me much beyond the later series of stories collectively called "A Group of Noble Dames." One can, for several reasons, imagine this opinion being challenged by Mr. Hardy himself, for he must have had a new and welcome pleasure in writing the charming "little histories" of these mostly frail Wessex dames of high degree. But surely in the "group" there is nothing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to equal, much less to surpass, the three finest of the "Wessex Tales"—"The Three Strangers," "The Withered Arm," and "Interlopers at the Knap." What an admirable story the last-named is! How much of it one would like to quote! I know nothing of its kind finer than "The Three Strangers." It stands out among the short stories by great writers of our time in much the same way as "Wandering Willie's Tale" among the brief essays in fiction of an earlier period. It has all the qualities of the best Netherland art, and is just what we might expect from Rembrandt were he to come among us again and take up the pen instead of the brush or the etching-needle.

But before the issue in book form of the "Wessex Tales" there appeared in 1887 one of the most notable of all Mr. Hardy's works. It has always been a puzzle to me why "The Woodlanders" seems, comparatively, so little known. One may ask a score of people which of Thomas Hardy's novels they have read, and probably not more than three or four at most will have any first-hand knowledge of this masterly and beautiful study. It is as absolutely the author's own as "The Return of the Native" or "Tess of the D'Urbervilles," for though his individuality is keenly marked throughout all his books, it is most dominant in these. The purport of the story is to exhibit "the unfulfilled intention which makes life what it is." It is a somewhat sombre tale, and there are scenes in it, as in "Tess," which seem to have given offence to those possibly worthy but stupid and blundering people who constitute themselves the champions of Mrs. Grundy and the exponents of that silly old lady's views; but to arrive at an estimate of Thomas Hardy's place in contemporary literature and to leave "The Woodlanders" unread would be like a similar estimate of Mr. Meredith without consideration of, say, "The Egoist" or "Diana of the Crossways." This nobly wrought book has something of the effect of night upon one, a sense of largeness and vast quiescence beyond all personal fret and weariness, of "night, that strange personality, which within walls brings ominous introspectiveness and self-distrust, but under the open sky banishes such subjective anxieties as too trivial for thought."

Nevertheless, when we come at last to "Tess of the D'Urbervilles" we have before us the most mature and, on the whole, the most powerful expression of the author's genius. I have read several parts of the book again and again, and have read the story as a whole twice, and in so doing I have felt as though all of Mr. Hardy's works that preceded it were in some sort a clearing of the ground—more or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less brilliant heralds, let me rather say, of this superb achievement. The romance has the power, the intensity, the inevitableness, and above all the warm humanity of the great dramas, ancient and modern. It is so homely in subject and deals so simply with simple things of common life in a remote English county that its effect upon the mind is all the more reason for our wonder and admiration. I can well believe what I heard a distinguished author declare, that no man, and certainly no woman, could read this book with sympathy and not thenceforth be of broader mind and more charitable and catholic spirit.

Tess herself is as *living* a woman as there is in fiction; but there is embodied in her also something that neither she nor Angel Clare nor any one ever guessed—the typical strength and weakness of an immense, possibly of a preponderating number of women. Every one has either read, is reading, or is about to read this book; so it is quite unnecessary to go into detail as to the narrative. But let it be said at once and conclusively that whatever is best in Thomas Hardy's work is to be found in this page from life—humor, pathos, tragedy, marvellous descriptive faculty, and that transforming magic through all, for which there is no other word than the much-misused term "genius." There are scenes in "Tess" which one cannot but believe will represent the high-water mark of our later Victorian fiction, and there are episodes which must surely touch the hearts and influence the minds of those who come after us almost as profoundly as they do our own. In depictive art there is nothing in the range of modern fiction, not even the narrative of the wooing of Lucy and Richard Feverel by the riverside, to surpass the supremely beautiful description of the morning meetings of Angel and Tess during the height of the milking-season at Talbothay's Farm, daily meetings in that "strange and solemn interval, the twilight of the morning, in the violet or pink dawn." Here we have the very spirit of romance, and here we have English prose of the noblest kind.

Every reader of Mr. Hardy's novels will differ as to the relative rank that ought to be given to each book. A consensus of opinion as to which are his three greatest works would be interesting and suggestive. I would advance a claim for preëminence in behalf of "The Return of the Native," "The Woodlanders," and "Tess of the D'Urbervilles." In these three books it seems to me that we have the highest development of a rare literary temperament, the finest and largest utterance of genius that can no longer be gainsaid as such.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thereafter ("Under the Greenwood Tree" not being considered as a novel, but rather as a sequence of rustic studies) would come "Far from the Madding Crowd," the three finest of the "Wessex Tales," and, though not quite with them, "The Trumpet-Major."

There is one quality which Thomas Hardy has far in excess of any other English novelist, that of the intimate sense of the complex interrelation of man and nature. Then, again, he stands alone as an exponent of the epical method. He is the sole living Englishman of whom I know who could write as Zola does at his best; who could do and has done writing so far beyond all the fret and fume of contemporary opinion as the close of that Titanic masterpiece "*Germinal*" or even of "*La Terre.*" He is an incomparably finer artist than Zola, and at the same time in intensity of concentration is the only man who approaches that great and much misunderstood writer. Yet, at his highest even, Zola has given us little of the commanding beauty of Mr. Hardy's speech at its best. No one can ever forget the solemn procession of "inspired" words at the close of "*La Terre*" or "*Germinal*"; but while they have the charm of vast perspectives seen from the dusty highway of life, Mr. Hardy's finest utterances exercise the spell of a not less real though a more remote realm of romance. One writer is a man who can see things only at his feet or else afar, the other a man whose clear and serene gaze takes in all, in just proportions. No living writer has given us more memorable pictures than of "the dewy morn" meetings of Tess and Angel Clare, already alluded to, or of Marty South and Giles Winterborne walking silently together in the chill, lonely hour before a winter day-dawn, "where gray shades, material and mental, are so very gray. And yet, looked at in a certain way, their lonely courses formed no detached design at all, but were part of the pattern in the great web of human doings then weaving in both hemispheres, from the White Sea to Cape Horn." It is somewl at sadly significant that it is the poet and clearer-eyed, saner, and more deeply observant writer who penned that profoundly pessimistic sentence in "Tess of the D'Urbervilles": "It is then [when "the constraint of day and the suspense of night neutralize each other"] that the plight of being alive becomes attenuated to its least possible dimensions." Is this to be Mr. Hardy's final word on the mystery of human life?

WILLIAM SHARP.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CONSUMER.

"I never loved a dear Gazelle
Nor anything that cost me much.
High prices profit those who sell,
But why should I *be fond of such?*"
"*Theme with Variations.*"—*Carroll.*

In examining the scanty records of antiquity side by side with the abounding ones of modern times, the careful student cannot but marvel that while in all other respects the doctrine of evolution is so manifestly upheld, the character of the Consumer gives it the lie. While (as the learned philosopher Herbert Spencer has irrefutably shown) all other things have, from being monotonously homogeneous and darkly indefinite, grown to be divertingly heterogeneous and dazzlingly definite, the Consumer, in spite of these perplexingly complicated changes in his environment, has not altered a jot. To-day, as in the times of Aristotle or the earliest Egyptian dynasty, his one indissoluble and indestructible characteristic is the love of bargains. Ancient or modern, his god is Cheapness, in the passion of whose adoration he sinks all regard for causes and consequences.

His ideal of conditions under which production shall take place is aptly illustrated by the parable of "The Two Broom-makers." These competitors, in order to satisfy the constant clamor for cheaper goods rife in their neighborhood, kept on cutting prices to the point where one was driven to the wall and compelled to shut his shop. Shortly after this untoward conclusion, the defeated manufacturer, meeting the victorious one, said:

"My friend (if I may be permitted so to address you), tell me, pray, how was it possible for you to undersell me, since (I confess it with shame) I stole all my materials?"

"Nothing simpler than that," replied the other: "I stole my goods ready-made."

Not that the Consumer countenances stealing. Oh, no! his religion forbids that. The Bible says, "Thou shalt not steal." But it does not say, "Thou shalt not eliminate wages, interest, rent, and profits." Such elimination is therefore a purely economic matter with which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faith and ethics have nothing to do; indeed (on the authority of some), they actually prescribe it. It is hardly necessary to add that by its means the Consumer gets all the benefits of stealing, without losing his chance or perhaps increasing his chance of going to Heaven.

Hence it is but natural that from the earliest times to the present day the mind of the Consumer has been intent upon eliminating, or at least reducing to the lowest possible level, those irksome factors of price. Guided by the light afforded by the knowledge of this characteristic, events of economic legislation from the earliest days to the present which might otherwise puzzle us are as easy to comprehend as the syllogism "Barbara." We are, for instance, no longer at a loss to understand the admiration in which the institution of slavery has always been held by the most eminent thinkers and philanthropists, and why it formed an integral part of the polity of such enlightened nations as the republics of Greece and Rome, and until quite recently of that of the United States of America. For do not slaves work without wages, and therefore does not slavery conduce to Cheapness? *Ergo*, slavery is a beneficent institution and slave-ownership an enlightened expression of philanthropy.

However, in the progress of time slavery, notwithstanding its manifest advantages to the Consumer, ceased to become practicable among Christian nations, and henceforth the element of wages could no longer be entirely eliminated. It then became essential to do the next best thing, viz., to keep wages down as low as possible and repress the injurious desire of laborers to obtain high wages in their selfish interests. Consequently, as soon as slavery and serfdom were abolished, we find the statute-books of civilized countries teeming with expressions of indignation at the insolence of the wage classes, who constantly desired to combine together in order to rob the poor Consumer, and who sometimes actually refused to do work unless their tyrannical exactions were submitted to. Laws fixing hours of labor and the proper pay for the laborer now began to adorn legislative records. This beneficent legislation of a positive character was, moreover, helped out (as such legislation always must be) by indirect and ancillary laws, as, for instance, statutes against vagrancy. If a beggar of a workman took it into his head that he would rather beg than work for wages that he deemed beggarly, these laws took the conceit out of him. And indeed, what would have been the use of making laws regulating wages and fixing the hours of labor if the laborer had the option of refusing to work?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some historians have criticised the old English vagrancy laws as too severe; and it must be admitted that they appear cruel when we read them without a knowledge of the situation which made them necessary. But knowing as we do that they were only prompted by benevolence in the interest of the poor Consumer, we can appreciate and value them, for there are only two methods of reducing wages to their lowest level. One is the simple one of direct regulations, fixing how much a laborer is to get for each particular job and the length of time in which he is allowed to accomplish it; the second, such indirect regulations as will tend to promote a lively competition among laborers. But what is the use of laws for the promotion of competition among laborers unless the laborer can be compelled to labor? If he is allowed to stop work and go begging, laws fixing hours of labor become meaningless.

We must, however, bear in mind that in the middle ages the laborer had no vote. From the day he obtained the suffrage, legislation tending to eliminate or at least mitigate him as an element of price has been swept out of existence. He has become even more important to the politician than the poor Consumer. If a price should now be fixed, it would be at a maximum and not at a minimum; if hours of labor are now regulated, it is at a minimum and not at a maximum. By legislation and otherwise the laborer is now supposed to be entitled to exact as much as the "traffic will bear." Competition between laborers, instead of being excited, as it formerly was, is now discouraged. Combination to raise the rate of wages is no longer a conspiracy, but a duty. The poor Consumer, who in previous ages was so well protected against the men who work with their hands, is now abandoned to their merciless exactions. He must recoup himself elsewhere.

Interest, the second element of price, has been, as history teaches us, looked upon with even less favor than wages. We find that sages and "other friends of their kind" have constantly declaimed against it, and that laws abolishing it or restricting it have always been received with acclamation. We do not read that it had ever been anywhere entirely suppressed, as wages are when slavery prevails; the reason for this historical discrimination in favor of interest being that you can whip a slave into working, but you cannot whip money into circulation: in other words, where there is no interest to be got, money vanishes, and this has never been considered desirable. When nations or individuals desire to borrow, it is convenient to have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some one around who has something to lend; and indeed, without people around who have money to lend, even legislators sometimes found life not worth living. Moreover, the hardship of borrowing is not remediless.

If the money-lenders become too importunate in their demand for interest, and possibly even go so far as to ask for the return of the principal when it is inconvenient to return it, you can in case of necessity murder them, or banish them, or outlaw them, or clip the coins on them if you are barbarous and mediæval; if you are enlightened and of the nineteenth century, you can repudiate your debt, or enact laws for the free coinage of silver. In spite, therefore, of the disfavor with which interest has at all times been regarded, it has been tolerated as a necessary evil and tempered by such methods as outraged nations and individuals always resort to when it becomes inconvenient, for the time being, to be bothered with it. It can be regulated by usury laws and other devices to keep it at a minimum, but there is but little hope of ever entirely eliminating it.

Rent, the third factor of price, and resembling interest in many respects, has, like interest, been tolerated at all times, but for altogether different reasons. In ancient times, as well as in the middle ages, the people who took rents took care also to make laws; and holding so agreeable a double position, their claim for recognition could not well be disputed. No serious attempt to regulate or restrict rent has therefore ever been made, excepting in Ireland.

Indeed, as a rule the landlord was favored in many ways by legislation at the expense of the other factors of price. When legislating it was important to him to think of himself as landlord and to forget himself as Consumer, making up for his losses in the latter aspect by repressing the other elements of price. Not that the Consumer did not resent this preferred claim, and chafe under the despotism which recognized it without the mitigation that wages, interest, and profits had always received; and so this despotism also was frequently tempered by burning the landlord and legislator's house over his head and cutting his throat. However, this means of relief never yielded more than a temporary advantage, as the landlords continued to exercise the law-making power and preside over the enforcement of the laws made by them, so that the punishment swiftly followed the crime.

Latterly, the position of rent, unlike that of the other factors of price, has been completely vindicated as far as the Consumer is con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cerned. For did not Ricardo discover that rent is not an element of price at all? Since that wonderful discovery was made the landlord has been able to keep on increasing his income without any prejudice whatsoever to the Consumer, including himself as such, and thus rent has been allowed steadily to rise without serious objections on anybody's part—excepting always in Ireland. That discovery has, in fact, enabled the landlord to kill two birds with the one stone. He has more of the wherewithal for purposes of consumption, and yet as voter can continue to aid in reducing the other factors of price which alone tend to make consumption expensive. There would seem now no limit to his prosperity were it not for Mr. Henry George, who has rightfully argued that on the very account of this condition of happiness, so superior to that of the rest of the community, the landlord ought himself to be eliminated. Not, indeed, for the mere negative benefit of the Consumer—as since Ricardo's discovery such elimination could by no possibility benefit the latter, as with or without rent expenses now remain the same—but on the higher ground of pure philanthropy and for the benefit of society in general, which ought to confiscate such a source of innocuous revenue. His argument, too, is meeting with constantly increasing favor, and some day, when we shall have reached a higher plane of civilization than that in which questions of mere elimination of elements of price are of importance, it will engage the serious attention of then otherwise unoccupied legislators.

Unpopular, however, as wages, interest, and rent have at all times been, they have never awakened the resentment of the Consumer to the degree called forth by that remaining augmenter of prices known as profits. It seems, in truth, absurd that any one should get more for a thing than he himself has paid for it. While there may be some justification for wages when any one who chooses can see work actually being done; while there is an excuse for interest because the lender actually deprives himself of his own money, and an excuse for rent because any one who chooses can see the land on which rent is paid, it is not so evident that it is just to pay for so simple a thing as lying awake at nights thinking, and borrowing money. It seems hard to be required to pay compensation for these operations every time one buys a loaf of bread or a paper of pins. Then, again, the man who takes the profit is so obtrusive; while wages, interest, and rent are modestly hidden in the price, and the Consumer can only obtain a glimpse of them by an effort of thought, for which, as we know, the Consumer, whose whole bent of mind is directed toward "con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suming," has neither time nor inclination. Thus the man who takes profits not only obtrudes his own person to the Consumer's eye, but he actually takes wages, interest, and rent under his wing, as it were, and incorporates in himself each hateful element of price. Is it a wonder, then, that he continues to be rightfully the subject of repressive legislation after such legislation has been abandoned as to the other elements? By squeezing him are not all these squeezed at the same time, without troubling either the brains or the conscience of the legislator or of his constituents?

Philanthropic people look with horror on the often-described terrors of factory and all other kinds of labor. Their hearts bubble over with infinite compassion whenever they are brought face to face with moving pictures of the difficulties attendant upon work. Their conscience prompts them to favor constantly increasing wages, but they feel that it would be wrongful that those wages should be increased at their expense. This is a proposition which is not for a moment to be thought of. What a comfort it is, then, for them to know that, after all, the profit-taker pays the wages; and as he is but a drone in society who does nothing but borrow money and think, it is pleasant for them to feel that they can still all their pangs of conscience and give vent to their sympathetic feelings for down-trodden humanity at the expense of so useless an object.

The same methods that used to be employed with so much success in keeping wages down to the lowest level, and possibly eliminating them altogether, have gone on, *pari passu*, for the benefit of the Consumer in respect of keeping down profits and possibly eliminating them. Profits, therefore, similar to wages, have been the subject of repressive legislation ever since Europe emerged from barbarism into statute-making. It is as easy to fix the price at which articles are to be sold as it is to fix the rate of wages, and just as easy as it is to prevent the laborers from combining in order to raise the rate of wages is it to prevent profit-takers from conspiring together in order to raise their profits; and it has been found at all times that laws against forestalling, engrossing, restraint of trade, combinations, trusts, and all other devices by which profits are expected to be increased (either by destroying competition or by restricting production) are easy to enact. After having enacted such laws, you can let competition do the rest. If that, then, goes to the extent expressed by the parable of the broom-makers above cited, so that the profit-taker will steal his things ready-made and eliminate for you the items of rent,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wages, and interest, and have his own share of price reduced to a minimum by appropriate legislation, the Consumer's millennium is at hand.

And the accurate historian must record with satisfaction that in the United States both methods of keeping down profits and consequently prices are making excellent progress, and if they are allowed to continue without interruption this millennium will be brought about by the aid of Congress, State legislatures, and the courts, with as little trouble as the transformation scene in a pantomime. In happy company side by side, the two methods adorn our records, sometimes employed at the same time on the same object and sometimes parting to meet again. Consider the wonderful results already accomplished by this combination in the matter of railroad rates! Can any one picture the unheard-of prosperity to which they will lead us when in the progressive lowering of those rates, affected by the united efforts of railroad commissions and unrestrained competition, wages, interest, rent, and profits in railroading, which make so large an item of cost to the Consumer, shall have been entirely eliminated?

Indeed, it is likely that by this method not only will it be impossible in future to construct any more of those instruments of tyrannic exaction, but perhaps even the time may come when those now existing will be torn from their beds, and their rolling-stock and appurtenances burned in a grand bonfire to Liberty; and when that happy period will have been reached, things will be so cheap that even the poorest wage-earner will be able to drive to his workshop in a coach-and-four. But superior in its probably beneficent effects, even to railroad commissions and the laws for unrestricted railroad competition, is that flower of benevolent legislation protecting the poor Consumer compared to which all previous statutes ancient and modern are only blooming buds—the Federal Anti-Trust Law. This is a law fitting to make the mediæval legislators turn in their graves with admiration and envy; and it is only proper that its first effect will be to secure for us an unfailing output of cheap whiskey.

Oh! for the Pindar to sing dithyrambs to the glories of our vigilant administration, which under the ægis of this sublime law, through the instrumentality of our revered courts, supported by the potency of our armies and navies, is now waging a holy war against those arch-conspirators who have combined together to restrict the production of that necessary of life! Would that in the revival

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the humane institutions of the middle ages, which is now so fortunately progressing, the pillory be included, so that after conviction, instead of obtaining the obscuring shelter of the prison walls, these malefactors may be put in stocks and exposed under the brilliant light of the day, as living witnesses to our controlling maxim: "*Fiat justitia pereat mundus*"—"Let us have bargains, though the world be drowned in liquor!" It is high time, too, that this crowning work, so auspiciously begun, be speedily brought to its consummation; for in the happy era now dawning upon us, when rent, interest, profits (and possibly wages) shall have been eliminated, life without unlimited whiskey is unthinkable!

ISAAC L. RICE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STANDARD OIL TRUST: THE GOSPEL OF GREED.

WHY condemn a trust which, it is alleged, is merely a partnership on a large scale? If you do not object to two men combining with two thousand dollars of capital, to carry on a mercantile business, why condemn two thousand men combined with a hundred millions, under the form of a corporation, or of eighteen corporations, in which the two thousand are stockholders, to engage in buying, selling, producing, and manufacturing a single commodity, together with all the ingredients, materials, and necessaries entering into the business of such buying, selling, producing, and manufacturing? The answers which the writer of the article on "Ten Years of the Standard Oil Trust" in the May FORUM seems to think so impossible to make are found in the statement of the questions. Indeed, there are many sufficient answers. One is apparent by direct admission in the article, "that association confers power upon the associates, that it gives them an advantage over unassociated individuals, and that such power may be used for evil as well as good," and in the statement, "While contending that association decreases prices, I must necessarily acknowledge that it makes competition by individuals difficult."

The conclusive answer to these theories is the same as the answer that would be made by free Americans to a proposition to establish in the United States a despotic monarchy. It is opposed to the spirit of our people and their institutions; it has been tried and condemned. It is not, as is pretended, the invention of a new system of economies for the benefit of mankind; it is merely seeking to impose upon us, galvanized into seeming life, a decayed relic of a former age, which our ancestors cast off and buried. There are still other objections to the kind of trust defended by Mr. Dodd beyond those that it tends directly to the establishment of monopoly and is a dangerous concentration of power in the hands of a few. The recently invented combination which has come to be known as a "trust" is formed by placing a majority of the shares of stock of a corporation in the control of persons called trustees. These are usually chosen from others than the body of stockholders or boards of direction of the several corpora-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, and act under an agreement that they will cast the votes represented by the stock so held for the perpetuation of the trust during the time agreed upon, and in furtherance of its purposes; will elect the officers provided for by law in each of the corporations, and in behalf of all of them manage the business of all except, it may be, in small matters of detail. It is a combination of corporations as well as of individuals. Each shareholder, upon surrendering his corporate stock to the board of trustees, receives a certificate entitling him to an interest in all the property and earnings of all the corporations in the trust. There is no limit to combination under such an organization. There may be a hundred or any other number of corporations chartered under the laws of forty different States; these may be composed of five thousand or more shareholders in each corporation, and each organization may by its charter be granted by the State the right to carry on a certain business, each different from the other.

In many of the States of the Union the law puts no limit to the capitalization of corporations, and organization for the purposes mentioned is substantially permitted in nearly all. The money capital of these forty corporations, chartered to do nearly all the business of the country affecting the daily life of the people, could easily be made to reach the enormous sum of a thousand millions of dollars. Under this plan of trust organization—which is, above all, the prevailing method, though the same result could be accomplished by a simple agreement for pooling of earnings—a majority of the stock of these several companies could be turned over to the control of nine men, or three, for that matter, who from some secure and carefully guarded aerie could conduct all of these several kinds of business as one. They could make and unmake prices and dictate the weal or woe, comfort or misery, of all the people of the land. The only way to make such an aggregation of power endurable would be to have all the people interested in it. But while the number of shareholders in this possible trust would be large, they would probably form but a small percentage of the entire population. And it is not likely that the managers of such a money-making combination would be desirous of increasing its members; and "profit-sharing," with all its beneficent incidents, would possibly be confined chiefly to the few whose influence was desirable in independent industries which the trust wished to control or absorb.

The courts of every State in the Union, when the question of the lawfulness of such combinations has been presented—and this has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been many times—have declared them to be illegal, besides being against public policy. Corporations are special creations of the law which grants to the individuals composing them the right of association with extraordinary privileges and powers as artificial persons acting in business matters under the law as natural persons. Being such, the law which creates imposes upon the corporation, as a condition of continued existence, that it shall not do anything not expressly authorized by its charter, except only as needful to carry out those powers specifically granted, and that it shall not abdicate its functions nor delegate them to some other person. If its business relates to the service of the public at large, as in the instance of a railway company, its duties must be discharged without favoritism and its compensation must be reasonable, uniform, and equal. The law deals with the corporation as the creature and servant of the state, vested with special powers and endowed with privileges, not merely and solely for money-making, but always in subserviency to the public welfare and under the control of the Government, which in this Republic means the people.

Therefore it is that these trusts are unlawful, because, through the surrender, by many differing and distinct corporations and by the individuals composing them, of the power to manage and control themselves, and by delivering over their corporate powers to some other person, as well as by engaging through the trust in many kinds of business not authorized by their respective charters, they have done prohibited things. The corporation so doing forfeits its right to exist to the people who bestowed it, and the trust existing solely through these violations of law is itself null. The principles underlying these decisions of the courts are recognized by the fundamental law of nearly all the States, and most notably have they been enforced by the judiciary of the State of New York in the "Sugar Trust" cases, where by three tribunals, through three successive and deliberate opinions, the law has been announced with strength of reasoning fortified by precedent and a courage and clearness worthy of the best days of Anglo-Saxon freedom.

A pitiable spectacle is presented by one of these betrusted corporations. Its stockholders are no longer an association of individuals carrying on the business of their choice; they meet by proxy and think by power of attorney. Its board of managers is not elected by its shareholders; its board of directors does not direct. The corporation is no longer an entity, moved to the discharge of its lawful functions by intelligent minds acting under the law and stimulated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by self-interest to the accomplishment of the best results. The nominal managers are mere puppets, guided to mechanical and arbitrary action by a committee of a few persons sitting, it may be, a thousand miles away. These trustees, assuming to exercise the corporate powers of several combined companies, are amenable to no law, governed by no charter, and are beyond the jurisdiction of the States whose delegated powers they are usurping.

The exact legal status of such a board of trustees is difficult to fix. So far as their contract obligations concern the individuals directly dealing with them, if it could be proved that in their organized capacity they had made a contract to do a lawful thing, they might probably be held personally responsible for its performance; but, as a rule, these stupendous combinations make their contracts through the separate corporate organizations composing them or through agents, shifting them about to suit a policy of concealment, so that it is nearly impossible for the ordinary business man to be sure with whom he has an agreement. The innumerable minor conspiracies against trade; the oppressions of private individuals; the unlawful and unjust competition by which those whose manhood has not been sapped out of them are driven into the trusts as the only alternative to business destruction; the briberies and corruptions that make spies and enemies of a man's own clerks and agents—these are usually the emanations of the board of trustees, acting through agencies so managed as to render detection difficult and the fixing of responsibility impossible. These are some of the incidental evils of the trust system. Would the evils of monopoly, of abuse of power, of destruction of individual energy and enterprise, of secret fraud and wrong, of irresponsibility to the law, of great wealth and power concentrated in the hands of a few, be made more endurable if, as is suggested, corporations could be formed under Federal law? No; the foundation of the hostility of the law to trusts, viewed as combinations of power to restrict and control trade, lies deeper than any legislative contrivance. This hostility represents the deliberate judgment of statesmen, of sociologists, and of jurists speaking with the eloquence of Burke and with the deeper philosophy and knowledge of human nature of Bentham, from age to age, in an unbroken line of thought; it is the indomitable spirit of liberty forever demanding human right.

The restrictions formerly existing in several States upon the privileges of doing business within them by corporations of other States have been substantially removed, and one by one are disappearing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are practically no restraints upon a corporation of any State in buying, selling, producing, or manufacturing in another or in all others. These things are done every day by innumerable corporations organized under the laws of probably thirty States. When some person who wants "large liberty" finds himself controlled by the law of the State where he lives, or by that of some State where his large liberty happens to have been exercised contrary to law, it is quite the fashion in these days for him to cry out against local self-government, and strive to place himself under some larger jurisdiction, incapable from its very magnitude of either comprehending or punishing his offence. Driven out from States where by constitutional enactments and judicial decisions his "large liberty of association" is pronounced a conspiracy against the public welfare, he turns to the Federal Government for relief, just as, if that failed him in his pursuit of money, he would endeavor to organize his trust under authority from the czar. No one objects to liberty of association nor even to large liberty of that kind; what every one does object to is the abuse of the liberty by making competition by individuals difficult, by the establishment of monopolies, the building up of uncontrolled power, the increase of prices to the consumer, and the destruction of individual enterprise and energy. The right of the individual to engage in private business—the freedom of contract—is more sacred than that of association.

A curious illustration of the distorting effect produced by gazing through the spectacles furnished by trusts and corporations is to be observed in the interpretation of the words "socialistic" and "communistic." A few years ago, when the interstate commerce bill was pending in Congress, a prominent railroad official, having had himself interviewed by a newspaper reporter, closed the statement of his views upon the proposed legislation by expressing a doubt whether it would be possible to secure a majority in Congress for this "communistic measure." It would therefore have been mildly surprising if, in an article defending trusts, we had not met the same idea, and had not been informed that a trust was denounced by persons of "communistic tendencies" because it had a large business and made much money; while if the trust was not too successful, it was tolerated by people "not too much tainted with socialism." If to contend against the unlawful exactions of overgrown power; to stand for the right of the individual against all kinds of illegal combinations in business life; to maintain the freedom of lawful contract against all powers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which would overthrow it; to insist that business as well as social and political problems shall be worked out by the intelligence of the individual in lawful and just competition with his fellows; and to oppose the special privileges and favoritisms that spring from the exercise of arbitrary power—if, in short, to deny the whole gospel of greed in its allegations of fact, its pretence of revelation, and its practical results, be socialism or communism, the wisest and best of mankind, sustained by the common sense of the great majority of all free people, may accept the imputation with pride. But we have yet to learn that the cultivation of individual energy is communistic. The opinions of those who have thought upon the subject are the reverse of this view.

Socialism and communism have for basic ideas the ownership, by an organization of individuals, voluntarily associated or united under a system of government, of all the means of production and distribution of the product to the consumer, and consequent ownership by the commune of all lands, houses, factories, railways, and means of transportation, while distribution is accomplished through persons chosen from their own number. There is no provision for competition in this plan, and an avowed object is its elimination. The individual is nothing, the prosperity of the commune everything. Communism, pure and simple, abolishes private property and takes the fruits of private labor. Socialism is nearly the same, except that to some extent there may be private ownership of property. Socialism is mild and conscientious communism; communism is radical socialism, and, uncontrolled, becomes incipient anarchism. Anarchism abolishes all law and order, reduces society to its original savage state in which force rules and the strong are enabled to gratify their lust for plunder upon the weak and unprotected. All three are diseased forms of "freedom of association."

The practical communist of this era is the person who, by means of a great corporation organized under Federal law or through a combination of corporations in the form of a trust, would control production, manufacturing, transportation, buying, selling, and distribution. He seeks to accomplish these socialistic objects by ownership of the means of production, manufacture, and transportation, and the welding together of all the branches of a particular business and its kindred industries. The description which Mr. Dodd gives of the Standard Oil Trust, its purposes, methods, and practical result, brings it palpably within the domain of communism. Competition with it by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individuals he admits to be difficult. Those who hope to compete with it must "adopt the methods and pursue the paths of progress adopted and followed by the most energetic," that is, of course, by the people in the trusts. This particular commune increased from forty persons to two thousand, and every employee who could save a few hundred dollars became interested in the profit. It gradually acquired the means of manufacture, transportation, and distribution. It makes nearly all things needed in its communal life; and yet the adherents of the system do not seem to be aware of the logical conclusions. Nor do they see that by blind devotion to the fetich of greed, with all producing and consuming mankind who are not in the combinations opposing them, they are rapidly reaching a point of defiance of law and disregard of individual right when men will no longer laugh at their vagaries or attempt to reason with hopeless and stolid folly. The devil of greed seems to have entered into their souls, and they are running down a precipice into a sea of destruction.

The Standard Oil Trust had at the beginning an immeasurable advantage over others who have sought to control for personal profit the necessary products of the earth. Petroleum was unknown as a possible article of extensive commerce before the year 1860. It was not until the year 1862 that its value began to be appreciated. The first wells were drilled a few feet into the ground by means of a springing pole or board, worked by the legs of a man. The production of oil by drilling wells with machinery became a great business through individual enterprise, skill, and ingenuity in the invention and perfection of numerous appliances, during a time when the projectors of the Oil Trust were unknown clerks engaged in other occupations. In 1865 factories for refining oil began to be numerous, and it was in this year, and not in 1870, that a Standard Oil Company was organized in Cleveland, with a capital of one hundred thousand dollars, and not one million dollars, in which were two or three of the present members of the Trust. From that time to 1870, those afterward known as Standard Oil men remained in the business, but they were not distinguished for introducing any marked improvements in processes of refining, quality of the product, or cheapness. They were like others —they were learning a new business.

About the year 1870, having previously had a taste of the flavor of special low rates of railroad freights, discriminating in their favor, they saw the marvellous possibilities of profit in the secret freight rebate when properly fortified by a division with the railroad agents.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1872 they conceived the organization of the South Improvement Company, and procured a special charter from the Pennsylvania legislature, which must always remain one of the curiosities of legislation. The authorized capital was unlimited; the actual capital subscribed was two millions. The subscribers were all, or the representatives of all, of the Standard Oil companies of Cleveland, Pittsburg, and Philadelphia, with whom joined Peter H. Watson, who became its president. In his testimony given April 5, 1872, before a Congressional investigating committee, he said that he was also acting as the representative of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, the Lake Shore Railroad Company, the Erie Railway Company, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, and the Atlantic and Great Western Railway Company, all of which reached the oil-producing region, and with each of which he said he held contracts for shipment of petroleum, the South Improvement Company being the other party. This company had, as appears by inspection of its charter and the contracts, no reason for existence except as a conduit for freight rebates.

The contracts purported to guarantee to each of the railway companies certain percentages of the oil traffic. The South Improvement Company, the predecessor of the Trust, assumed to offer to the railroad companies, in consideration of their worship, all the kingdoms of petroleum, to which, like a celebrated character who once made a similar proposal, it had no shadow of title. It agreed to ship over these railways all the product of petroleum, crude and refined. On the other hand, the railway carriers agreed to pay to this company rebates and drawbacks on all oil transported—*on that shipped by other shippers*, as well as by this South Improvement Company. These rebates and drawbacks from the open or represented rate of freight were: on crude petroleum from 40 cents to $1.06 per barrel, and on refined oils from 50 cents to $1.32 per barrel. One of the shareholders, since a member of the Standard Oil Trust, testified, at the investigation before referred to, that "there is a large number of refineries in the country—a great deal larger than is required for the manufacture of the oil produced in the country." It therefore appears that one of the things in the minds of the projectors was the decrease of refining capacity, the lessening of the output, to be followed, presumably, by an increase of price.

He also testified that in one locality the railroad companies were to charge all shippers as freight not exceeding $1.50 per barrel, and pay a rebate to the South Improvement Company of $1.06 per barrel,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether it was the shipper of the oil or not, so that under these contracts the Standard Oil Company members would pay no more than 44 cents per barrel as freight to the carrier, while their competitors would pay $1.50, and of this last sum the railroads were to pay back to the combination $1.06 per barrel. The monstrous character of this scheme appears from a mere statement of it. The effect would have been to drive out of the business every refiner, producer, and shipper not in the conspiracy. This is ancient history, long since recorded in accessible volumes, but its introduction here is necessary by reason of the total omission of any account of these antecedents in the article in the May FORUM. When it became known to the great number of people actively engaged in the petroleum business that the railroads proposed to tax their occupations out of existence for the benefit of a few individuals, there was a great storm of indignation, and, by reason of mass-meetings and appeals to the legislature and to Congress, the South Improvement Company, which met for organization in January, 1872, went out of existence in April of that year. Its charter was repealed and the railroad companies cancelled the contracts.

Immediately thereafter the Standard Oil companies made other similar arrangements, but secretly, by which they received from the railroad carrying companies substantially the same rebates and drawbacks, under like discriminating contracts. Though at this time the Standard companies controlled but a small part of the shipments, yet the acquisitions of money from this source were immense, estimated to have been in one year nearly three and one-half millions of dollars. The destruction of competitors went on apace. As early as 1875 nearly all of the interior petroleum refineries had been driven out of business, purchased, or absorbed. They could not live under the exactions of twice the freight on their manufactures paid by the Standard companies. These institutions now became great. Their capitals were increased, and under the general name of the "Standard Oil Company" had come to be known, and its methods with railroad men who held positions of power attracted wide attention. Mr. Simon Sterne said, before the investigating committee of the State of New York in 1879, that the dealings of the Standard Oil Company with the railroads exhibited "the most shameless perversion of the duties of a common carrier to private ends that has taken place in the history of the world." It may well be inferred that such reckless conduct was not unaccompanied with private considerations to those railway agents who held positions of advantage in regard to fixing freight

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rates. Some of them became rapidly rich and retired with unexplainable fortunes.

The Standard Oil Company did not in these years, 1865 to 1878, do anything to improve the methods of conducting the petroleum business. It was busy making money from railroad rebates. When it from time to time absorbed an independent refinery, it frequently took with it skilled men, long connected with the business, whose talents were thenceforth employed in the interests of the embryo Trust. The Standard Oil Trust was not the result of any superior skill or ability of its projectors. It was founded in injustice and built up by an enormous wrong secretly done, for the facts given became public long after the perpetration of the offences, and only through legislative and judicial investigations. A new business, peculiar in all of its characteristics by reason of the nature of this new mineral product, necessarily called into activity inventive genius and brought to its assistance individual energy and ingenuity for the production of appliances helpful to success. Among these was the local pipe line for transporting the fluid crude product from the wells to the refining factories and to the railroads for transportation. But neither the Standard Oil Company nor any of its members invented, originated, or put into practical operation this needful transportation facility; nor yet the immense tanks necessary for the storage of the commodity. These also were put into successful use by the individuals in the business whose experience taught them their usefulness. The embryo Trust saw that they were good, bought them or absorbed them, taking in many instances their originators and owners with them as employees. As the largest and best oil refineries ever built up to this time were the result of individual enterprise and capital, so the great factor, the local pipe line, was invented and put into successful operation without the assistance of those mighty brains which apparently were limited to the capture of the acquisitions of others. At a later day there came a time in the history of the petroleum business when the iron tank car, for carrying oil in bulk upon the railroads, superseded other methods of transportation. But these were not introduced by the Standard Oil Company, but by a company engaged in the business independently, and which afterward, by a combination between the railway company over the lines of which they ran and the Standard Oil Company, was forced to sell and go out of the business.

Still later the conditions of transportation and the persistent discrimination in rates of freight in favor of the Standard Oil Company

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made it necessary to try the experiment of pumping crude petroleum long distances from the region of its production to the seaboard. The reason for this enterprise was that no refiner, either in the interior or at tidewater, could compete against the discriminating rates of freight given by the railroads to the Standard Oil Company. The interior refineries were nearly all gone, and the business had left the region of crude production, to assume new forms five hundred miles away. Hence a number of experienced and energetic men laid the first line of pipe to a point near the sea, and there made an alliance with a railroad company excluded from the "Oil Pool" to carry it further, and eventually this line was extended to the harbor of New York. Did the Standard Oil Company originate this great enterprise or assist it? No; it laughed at it, discouraged it, fought it with its whole power and its peculiar weapons, and only after its success was established did the Trust imitate it.

It is said in the article under review that the tendencies of great combinations of capital organized to control commerce in a commodity of general use is to create competition between rival associations, even though they may have destroyed it between individuals. But how can this be? As an association must originate in individual effort, what are the inducements to men who can see no opportunities for gain in a certain business to combine themselves to carry it on? If they do so, we have the warring of lawless competition between two or more trusts, in place of the broad and diversified efforts of individual intelligence. Competition in skill, in excellence of quality, in processes of production, is as desirable as, yes, more desirable than, any other. But in practice all competition would soon cease, as may be seen by the constant recurrence of railroad freight pools, the only check upon which, as recently shown by Mr. Charles Francis Adams, is the dishonest violation of the pooling contracts by the railroad officials themselves. Long ago, when the first railway in England was taking its first steps, Stephenson laid down a rule which has survived the test of a half-century of experience, "that where combination is possible competition is impossible." As soon as one combination is able to compete successfully with another, the two form an alliance of some kind, so that competition will not diminish the gains of either.

The Standard Oil Trust has proved the truth of Stephenson's maxim, as it has demonstrated the verity of nearly all other arguments against such trade combinations. The Tidewater Pipe Com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pany, Limited, projected its line toward the seaboard in 1880. It was the first thing of the kind. It is a part of the current history of the period that a secret meeting of the Standard officials and certain railway managers was held on the Canada side at Niagara Falls, and ways and means devised to destroy the rival of the embryo Trust. Oil was soon after carried by the railways from the region of production to the seaboard for almost nothing—about five cents per barrel as nearly as can be ascertained. This "war of rates" was continued until some time in 1884, when the Tidewater Company made an alliance with the Standard Trust, and there have ever since been peace and money for the two, but no competition. The consumer pays the same price for his light whether sold by one company or the other.

Mr. Dodd says the main purpose of his article is to show how one trust decreased prices to the consumer. This he attempts to do by comparing prices of illuminating oil as they were in 1872 with those of 1891. The difficulties in the way of accepting this argument lie in the errors in his fundamental premises. We are informed that the Trust was organized January 2, 1882. From 1872 to 1882 there were no trusts upon the plan of this particular combination. Prior to the last date, these associations for making money out of the public had taken the form of secret conspiracies by contract, and the nature of them can be ascertained by examination of the case of the Barclay Coal Company, in which a decision was made by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. During the whole ten-year period from 1872 to 1882, there was active individual competition in all branches of the petroleum business, and included in it was part of the season of excessive competition between the Tidewater Pipe Company and the Standard Oil Company, backed by the railroads. The decline in the price of refined oil during that period cannot therefore be credited to the Trust, but rather, in addition to the natural results from the development of a new business by individual skill and energy, to competition, hampered only by the injustice of railway discrimination.

During the period from 1862 to 1871, inclusive, the decline in the price of refined petroleum was from 36.38 cents per gallon to 24.24, or 12.14 cents. From 1872 to 1881, inclusive, the decline was from 23.59 cents to 8.01, or 15.58 cents per gallon. From 1882 to 1891, inclusive, the decline was from 7.39 cents to 7.30 per gallon, or nine-one-hundredths of a cent. The period from 1862 to 1871 was that of unrestricted trade and free competition in all branches of the business, except only as affected in the last three years of the period by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then unperfected system of railroad freight discrimination, introduced, but not originated, by the projectors of the Trust. Examination of the statistics during these three successive decades will show that from 1862 to 1872, the period of free competition, but in a new and experimental industry, the decline in price was over 30 per cent; from 1872 to 1882, during which competition existed on a larger scale and the business became settled and better managed, the decline was over 60 per cent; during the reign of the Trust, from 1882 to 1892, the decline in price was but a trifle over 1 per cent, while to the American consumer it was practically nothing.[1]

In Mr. Dodd's article, as well as in this, the wholesale prices are given, and these are usually of export oil at the harbor of New York. But this is not the price to the consumer. During the period of the Trust, the American consumer of petroleum has paid a very much greater price than eight cents per gallon, except when it became necessary for the Standard Oil Trust to destroy a competitor by temporarily selling at a low price, sometimes below cost; and when competition was thus eliminated the price was raised. The prices paid by the consumer within and during the past ten years have been as high as thirty cents per gallon at non-competitive points. Prices have ranged from twenty-three cents per gallon to ten, and stood at many places at sixteen and eighteen. To-day, at non-competitive points, the price is often eight, ten, and twelve cents. These facts and figures speak for themselves. In this matter, as in all others, the Trust has demonstrated that the reduction of price to the consumer, even where it has been real, has been made "for the purpose of crushing competition," and as soon as the end was accomplished the consumer paid for this short-lived cheapness by an immediate increase of price.

Within the past three years the Standard Oil Trust has entered upon a new system by which it is attempting to seize the ownership of all or nearly all of the oil-producing territory of the country, and add to its gigantic monopoly the only remaining branch of the petroleum industry which it does not fully control. It has organized corporations for drilling wells, acquired by purchase mining rights in vast acreages of land in Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, paying prices before unknown to the operator and beyond his reach. It is pressing drilling operations with its enormous capital,

[1] The figures for these computations are taken mainly from a schedule furnished through the Standard Oil Trust to the Congressional committee on commerce, during the investigation by it in the spring of 1888.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under conditions of a crude-oil market, of its own making, of about fifty-four cents per barrel, a price far below the cost of production. I say of its own making, because it is practically the only buyer from the well-owner. It is applying the power of money, acquired by the methods I have indicated, in unlawful and ruinous competition, for the purpose of driving out of the producing department of the business the experienced men who have made wealth for the country during more than a quarter of a century of their active lives. Under the system of individual activity barren spots have been made productive, cities have been built, railways constructed, homes established, and intelligent and prosperous communities have grown up.

If the trust plan of business is to prevail, it means that it is a good thing for combinations of capital to absorb one by one the industries into which men, in the pursuit of natural right, have deemed it best to enter to obtain a livelihood; that a man is worth more to himself and his country as the salaried employee of a great corporation or aggregation of corporations than in the independent exercise of his abilities as a producer of wealth. It means that this is a good thing in coal, iron, wheat, and all other products, as well as that it is good that nine men should control all the oil wells, refineries, pipe lines, all means of distribution, the newspapers which furnish the statistics of the business; that they should make their own acids, cans, barrels, paint, glue, tanks, pipes; that they should dictate the price for the light in the home and at which the producer sells his product; that in order that the Trust might make more money to add to its millions, by competing with Russian oil it may ruin the American oil-producer and force him to sell to the Trust or go out of business. Is it really true that the world has rolled backward to this desperate condition? Is it true that the force of money, moved by avaricious intelligence, has but taken the place of that physical force with which power, in earlier days, inflicted the wrongs against which all freemen successfully rebelled? Before we answer in the affirmative, let there be careful investigation of the facts, and let the spirit of manhood, moral sentiment, and religious conviction unite with the active business interests of the land in protest against the gospel of greed.

ROGER SHERMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WASTE OF WOMEN'S INTELLECTUAL FORCE.

In the May number of the Forum, President Dwight says that the higher education is "for the purpose of developing and cultivating the thinking-power. It is to the end of making a knowing and thinking mind." And therefore it "should be given to the daughters and the sons alike. If education is for the growth of the human mind . . . the womanly mind is just as important . . . as is the manly mind."

Are there not certain reasons why—at all events in America—the higher education is even more imperatively needed by women than by men? I do not mean because it will fit them to share more largely in the work which men now perform, but because it will fit them for the better performance of work which must specially devolve upon them. In the first place, the higher education is "for the purpose of developing and cultivating the thinking-power." Nothing else can do this so thoroughly. But certain other experiences, to which women are not generally subjected, may partially take its place with men. In the active work of his life a man must learn to use his mind more or less well. But the active sphere of the woman is usually her home. Her active interests are all personal; she comes in vital contact with few human beings except her friends, and she can shift upon the men of her family many responsibilities which they must learn to deal with themselves. Life does not do for her what it does for the man, and of course it is not desirable that it should. If, therefore, her mind is not trained by the higher education, there is a great chance that it will not be trained at all to work intelligently even within a very narrow circle. While, however, the chief purpose of the higher education is to develop the individual as such, not to prepare brain and hand for any special kind of work, its value as a foundation for the activities of life cannot be left out of sight. And if this value is considered, it seems doubly true that women need it even more imperatively than men.

Usually, in those classes which can aspire to the higher education at all, a woman marries and is not forced to support herself. What is her life's work? It is to retain her husband's affection and confidence by retaining his respect, interest, and admiration; often to counsel him,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sometimes to guide or restrain him, and always to understand him; to order their common household properly and properly expend their income; to see that their children are well cared for, well trained, well taught, and well amused; to make and keep desirable friends for her husband, her children, and herself; and meanwhile to make herself happy in this career. For none of this work does she need to be deeply versed in any special branch of knowledge. In little of it would any thorough professional or technical training be of great service to her. But for it all she needs to be an intelligent person, to have a "trained and cultivated power of thought." Women's work is "all-round" work; and as a class women have never done it properly, because they have not had an all-round training. We think we know what the best possible wives and mothers and house-mothers are; but we do not, for we have seen them too seldom and too widely isolated. We have noted examples here and there, but we have no conception of what a community would be were such examples typical instead of exceptional.

The specialized education that would suffice to make a good physician, botanist, chemist, or artist of a girl is better for her, of course, than no serious training at all. But it is not the kind of training that is most likely to make her the best possible wife, mother, house-mother, and member of society. It is not the kind that will most surely, thoroughly, and widely develop her mind and soul. Perhaps there may be "more to show for it" when a decade or two has passed. Yet I think that women will be more likely than men, absorbed in active external occupations, to retain the knowledge they have gained while highly developing their minds. Moreover, I do not think it matters greatly if, at thirty or forty or fifty, a woman who has been broadly educated can no longer read a page of Greek, or do a problem in mathematics, or explain the difference between Kant's philosophy and Hegel's. Her mind will have been trained by her study of these things better than it could have been trained by any narrower process, and it will continue to think seriously though it may think upon other subjects. Her mind will have been opened and clarified and broadened, and her power of thinking logically will have been cultivated. She will have learned to follow a line of reasoning with precision, to say exactly what she means, and to comprehend exactly what other people mean. She will know what the world has been and so understand what it is. She will grasp the meaning of life and its opportunities and risks, and so be able to moderate her hopes, bear up against her disappointments, and discipline her imagination. She will be a companion for intelligent men and a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

help to those who are not intelligent. She will share her children's lives when they are grown as well as when they are little. She will keep in touch with the great world, and make her own small world a place where common sense presides. She will be an intelligent, reasonable human being; and if she is this, even though she do no external work in the world, she will be the most useful kind of a woman. And she will have the best chance of being the happiest kind of a woman.

The advantages of what President Dwight calls "intellectual oneness" in married life are probably obvious to all. But I may say that they are most obvious when we leave unhappy marriages out of sight, as very possibly due to other causes than intellectual disparity, and contrast happy married lives devoid of true companionship with happy married lives which include it. We have seen many happy marriages where there is no more intellectual kinship between the man and his wife than between him and his little children. But there are kinds and degrees of contentment, satisfaction, and active enjoyment. Love which persists in spite of disparities, limitations, and hindrances, and love which persists with full intellectual sympathy, true comradeship, genuine friendship, are very unlike in the measure of happiness they can bestow. As it is between wife and husband, so it is, of course, between mother and children. Many mothers who have no intellect at all and scarcely even a tincture of common sense are fondly loved by their intelligent sons. But does such love as this profit them or profit their sons, even in the way of happiness, half so much as the love between another mother and the sons who find her their intellectual equal, their intelligent companion, their most sympathetic friend?

Here I may turn again from the happiness to the usefulness of women—if, indeed, these things can really be dissevered. In our country at least, a mother needs the training of the higher education even more than a father; for father and mother do not often guide and control their children in equal measure. Much less is the father's influence preponderant. The mother usually does most of the work, and sometimes practically does it all. The fact must be regretted, but its import should be generally recognized. It would be easy to explain how, if women had better trained minds, our social life would improve and broaden. But this has often been shown before, and I do not think that any one who has seriously considered the subject is deluded by the popular fallacy that American women are more intelligent, even in their "society" aspect, than American men. They have a better developed social instinct; they have a lighter conversational touch; they have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more accomplishments; and they often have a wider reach of superficial knowledge upon what I may call ornamental subjects. But they know much less about the actual living world and its affairs and needs; they are much less likely to understand any subject really well; and their thinking upon any subject is much less likely to be profound or logical or vitally suggestive. One of the things, at all events, that society needs to make it a valuable factor in life, a real factor in the lives of our most intelligent men, is that the native quickness, brightness, wit, imagination, and volubility of our women shall be disciplined and at the same time developed; that their conversation shall be based upon wide and genuine knowledge, not upon a little desultory learning, and shall be controlled by a systematized power of thought.

There is still another relationship between men and women, not exactly domestic, not exactly social, which would vastly profit by the thorough training of women's minds. I mean the relationship that is called friendship. Largely shut off as women must and should be from the enterprises and struggles of the active outer world, need they be limited to the companionship of other women and of the men of their own families? Yet, after early youth, are they not usually thus limited, except for that casual, superficial, fragmentary, unfruitful, and at length tiresome kind of association which society in its present state brings about? Are not the genuine interests of a woman's life usually confined to her personal affairs, to those of her immediate family, and to those—as narrow as her own—of a few feminine friends? What does she know, except in the vaguest way, about the great currents of existence even in her immediate neighborhood, about the lives and schemes, the ideas, interests, and aspirations of the men who form, direct, and give character to the community in which she lives? What chance has she to develop as a member of this community, as a social factor in the wider sense, as an American citizen, as an influence for incitement, direction, or restraint? Would not all this be changed if she more often had a "knowing, thinking mind," and so were fitted for true friendship with intelligent men? We hear much of the good effect that the advent of woman suffrage would have upon men as well as women. Greater and better, I think, would be the effect upon men as well as women if both sexes possessed in equal measure "knowing, thinking minds," if men could find among women sympathetic, sensible, and interesting comrades.

Some people, I know, and especially the editors of comic papers, profess to believe that the development of women's minds is undesir-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able, because, although it might increase the chance of happiness in married life, it would lessen the number of marriages by lessening the attractiveness of young women. But I do not think that this position is seriously held by any sensible observer. The higher education, rightly pursued and really gained, is not an influence that will make women pedants, prudes, prigs or blue-stockings, shrews, amazons or hard, cold, semi-masculine monstrosities. To be broad-minded, clear-minded, free-minded, active-minded, is not of necessity, nor even of likelihood, to be "strong-minded." Indeed, the more a woman knows of life, the better she understands the past and present of the world and the experiences and conclusions of its greatest thinkers, the less likely she will be to confuse the masculine and feminine ideals or to underrate the latter in comparison with the former.

It is the narrow, superficial education of women which leads them to maintain that there is "no difference" between themselves and men, or that men's normal opportunities are loftier than their own, and which consequently makes them envy men and desire to step into their place. The really educated woman, the one whose mind really knows and thinks, can comprehend better than any one else the true meaning and glory of womanhood, the true importance of its peculiar responsibilities, the true value and charm of its peculiar privileges; for she alone is able to attest and appraise these things, and, moreover, she has learned that the growth of civilization implies a progressive specialization of capabilities and efforts, and that the advancement of women has meant a steady departure from that primitive, barbaric state where men and women were not more widely differentiated than are male and female animals to-day. If she claims a share in the man's right to the higher education, it is first of all that she may be fitted to do work which a man cannot possibly do, and may help the world along in a way that is parallel, not identical, with his.

On the other hand, I do not agree with those who think that were women's minds better developed, the world-old danger from unlawful or from superficial, transitory sentimental relationships would be removed; but I do think that it might be lessened. The normal man must have, in some shape, the companionship of women, and he needs it just because it is never precisely the same in flavor as companionship with other men. It is normal and desirable that even the love of a brother for his sister, of a son for his mother, of a father for his daughter, of a man—young or old—for the woman outside his family who is his sincere and affectionate friend, should be tinged with a sen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

timent which does not exist in his feeling for his brother, his father, his son, or his masculine friend. This is normal and desirable, and, fortunately, quite inevitable. And the same things are true in a converse sense; they are true of the feeling which women have toward men.

But there is a vast difference between this kind of sentiment, from which almost everything that has meant progress for the world has sprung, and that stronger kind of sentiment or that more foolish kind of sentimentality wherein dangers great and small reside. And when the minds of women interest and satisfy men as much as their bodies and souls, I think the fundamental, universal sentiment will persist and even develop, that the stronger kind will be better regulated, and that the more foolish kind will decrease. Married men, I am sure, will be happier with their wives. Unmarried men will choose their wives more wisely; or, if the lightning of love still strikes at random, the bolt will more often be thrown by a sensible as well as a charming young woman. And when associating with women whom they do not think of marrying, all men will be less apt than they are to-day to feel that sentimentality is expected of them or is likely to be offered to them. And, once more, as it will be with men, so, conversely, it will be with women. Often to-day there is small common ground for that intimacy between men and women to which nature prompts except sentimental ground. Widen the field of companionship and the danger of an undue cultivation of the sentimental tract will be decreased. When women have taught men that they want and value real friendship, that they can be loyal, interesting, and profitable friends in the same sense that men are to one another, yet always with that delicate flavor of difference which will make feminine friendship desirable no matter how much masculine friendship may be at hand, then men will not be so ready to drop into the attitude of lovers or of make-believe lovers. Yet there will be lovers enough, for this instinct is even more imperious than the instinct toward friendship. And once the lover is transformed into the husband, there will be a better chance of life-long constancy.

Moreover, in true friendship, based upon mental parity, people are not limited to comrades of their own age, with whom, of course, the dangers of sentimentality are greatest. An intelligent old woman can have true comradeship with intelligent young men, outside her family as well as within it. And it is hard to say whether, in such relationships, the benefit is greater to the woman or the man: to the woman, whom they may keep young and fresh and useful; or to the man, whom they may train and form, restrain and inspire, and to whom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they may give an idea of feminine possibilities which will serve him well when choosing for himself a wife. If the history of French social life in the last century is read with understanding, it gives valuable lessons upon these points. It shows, indeed, the dangers of passion and of sentimentality; but it also shows the possibility and the immense profit of friendships between men and women which are based upon intellectual affinity and common interests of a serious sort.

Thus far I have spoken simply with reference to that which is and must continue to be the chief work of the majority of women in the upper strata of society. How is it as regards the women in these strata who are forced to support themselves? They are as men are: the higher education will profit them vastly, even though they may be able, by virtue of a narrower professional training, to "get along" without it. And yet they are not quite as men are. Less often than men do they know from childhood that they will have to labor to live; usually they find it out when there is no longer time for special training in any direction, and must take up something for which a "general education" has fitted them; and, of course, the broader this has been, the better and more numerous will be their opportunities.

But there is still another class of women to be considered; there are the women who have no specially feminine work to do and who do not need to work for money. This class includes many women who are unoccupied and are discontented, but do not realize that the latter fact may spring from the former; it also includes many who realize that they would be happier if they were busy, but are helpless to exert themselves, or even to interest themselves, in any special direction. Better cultivated minds, even if their powers were turned to no "practical" account, would do much to make these idle women more contented; for their social life would be enlarged and vivified, and of course their powers of self-entertainment would be greatly increased. But, on the other hand, more and more women, influenced by the strenuous temper of American civilization, will come to feel that a life without active interests is no life at all; and, if they are shut out from the normal interests which the house-mother finds, will want to exert themselves in some other direction. Must they go forth and battle with the world side by side with men? Is there not much work of another sort awaiting them—work for which the higher education would prepare them, work which needs insistently to be done, and of which only a fragment can be done by men?

The constant complaint of our most intellectual men is that they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have no leisure for the highest kinds of work. What America needs, they say, is an intellectual leisure class, able to devote itself unselfishly to the advancement of literature, science, art, and philanthropy. We need a class of students; at present, with a few exceptions, we have simply a class of studious money-makers. Our scientific and literary men cannot properly pursue those highest paths of labor, experiment, and research which bring in no reward except benefit for the world and good repute for the laborer. They must be professors, school-teachers, or journalists, or employees of the Government or of corporations; or they must write "salable" books and magazine articles. They cannot think wholly of their pursuits as such; they must think first of their money-making capabilities. For this reason you will find many a scientific man or scholar who rejoices in that rapid accumulation of wealth in which you may see only danger to the Republic, and who advocates State or Government aid for enterprises which you think should devolve upon individual effort. We greatly need, he says, an intellectual leisure class, and we should be content to run some risks for the chance of securing it.

But have we not, all ready to our hand, a leisure class which might be made intellectual? While our men are forced to neglect the highest tasks for the sake of supporting themselves and their families, is it needful, wise, or right that many of their women should be wholly idle? Should they not be encouraged to take up the unremunerative work from which their fathers and husbands are debarred? Would not this be a better way of getting it done than for them to earn money so that men might do it? Must we not think so unless we believe that it is "just as good" for a woman as for a man to go forth and battle with the world? And can we believe this? Even if American women came to believe, would American men?

In order to do some of the kinds of work which I have in mind, thorough professional training is required; but for others the higher education is itself the professional education. To be an experimental chemist one must have mastered chemistry; but to be a scientific philanthropist or historian no technical course of study is required. Even in the former case nothing militates against women's entering the field even comparatively late in life, for, unlike men, they will not be hurried by the need of material reward. But in every case the higher education is imperatively needed as a basis; for the noblest, deepest, subtilest, least commercially remunerative kinds of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor and investigation demand, not only that knowledge shall be as full as possible, but that the mind shall work at its very best.

The class of American women to whom I refer have plenty of time at command, and the noblest kinds of intellectual labor are, as a rule, the very ones that are best fitted for their undertaking. I mean that, as a rule, these can be pursued at home. Of course I do not intend this term to be taken in its literal sense. I use it simply to mark a contrast with the struggling marts of the world. In this sense a woman works at home when she works in a public library or a college laboratory; but she does not when she goes into courts of law, or practises as a physician, or has a desk in a newspaper office. By working at home I mean keeping out of active, personal contact with masses of money-making men, living to one's self, directing one's own activity, commanding one's own hours. And the power to do this is, I think, not only pleasant, but essential to the generality of women, because of their peculiar temperament, which we cannot desire to see masculinized, because of those demands which the family and society must make to some degree even upon an independent spinster, and also because of the characteristics of the feminine physique. Even speaking literally, many of the highest intellectual tasks can be pursued at home. Within their own four walls those American women who are now wholly or almost wholly idle might add immeasurably to the sum of the world's intellectual wealth, although within those walls they might not often be able to earn fortunes, or even comfortable livings, for themselves. For example, Mr. Godkin said recently in the FORUM that the present trend of American political life seemed to indicate that in the future it must be influenced for good indirectly rather than directly, with the pen rather than with the voice. We may not altogether believe this; but there can be no doubt that, in politics as in a hundred other matters, indirect influence is immensely powerful. Surely this field might be opened to home-keeping women whether the polling-booth is or not. The field of general literature is already entirely open to them, but as yet they usually do no more than scratch its surface with such tools as men threw away centuries ago. Certain scientific fields, where patient observation is the main requisite for success, seem peculiarly destined for their tillage. And the natural impulse of women toward charitable work might really ameliorate our social conditions if it were thoroughly disciplined and wisely directed.

I believe that many of our women would learn to do such work as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have in mind if the higher education were granted them. At all events, it is well worth while to give them the chance, since—and this is the chief point of my argument—the preparation which would fit them for it is the one that would best prepare them for the normal activities of feminine life. If you give your daughter the higher education you give her the best chance to be a useful and happy wife, mother, and member of society, and you also give her the best chance to be useful in the noblest way if she never has a husband, home, or child. No scheme of education based upon the needs of a minority should be warmly advocated in this democratic land. I should not plead for the higher education of all girls if it were chiefly to benefit those who may have to earn their livings, or those whose lives may be unoccupied by domestic duties. But if a scheme which is best for the majority is best also for the minorities, are not its claims indisputable?

In certain cases a girl may show so strong a leaning toward one kind of intellectual labor that she will have a clear right to be prepared for it from early youth. But just because she is a girl this preparation should be as broad as possible. Her little brother, who insists upon being a doctor, may possibly be allowed to omit the college course as the need for self-support will press upon him. But if she insists upon the same thing, her deeper and wider education should redeem the obligatory narrowing of his. And in later days, while he is tending the sick, she may be carrying on that studious, experimental work which is less remunerative, but in which he would gladly engage if he were not forced to maintain his family. If she never marries, her leisure for it may be almost limitless; and if she marries, wide leisure may come to her in middle life when her children have grown up and left her, while even during their childhood she will have many hours which can be devoted to study, although they could not be given to the active exercise of a profession. If I recall the amount of work which Darwin accomplished during years of extreme physical weakness, I do not, of course, intend to set up a standard for the aspirations of partly occupied women. Yet there is instruction in the reference, for it shows that all the hours of all the days in the year are not needed for the accomplishment of very important tasks.

But in most cases a girl will have no definite aspirations, and neither she nor her parents will know what activities life may have in store for her. The probability is that she will marry, but there is a chance that she will not. The probability is that she will not have to support herself, but there is a chance that she may. If her parents pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pare for the probabilities by developing her as an individual, by cultivating the "sphere within," they will also be preparing for the chances, fitting her for the highest usefulness in any possible "sphere without."

If once we recognize that the strongest argument for the higher education of women is not that they may have to work for their living but that they probably will not have to, then many of the objections to it fall away. Chief among them in the mouth of the thoughtful is the belief that serious education puts too great a strain on the relatively weak feminine physique. I am far from thinking that the feminine physique is as strong as the masculine, whether bodily or mental exertion be required of it. Indeed, my rating of its relative weakness is probably lower than that of most men would be. But a deficiency in the quantity of mental power does not necessarily mean an inferiority in its quality. I do not think that women in general can do as much work as men, and I am sure that they ought not to be bound to do it as regularly. But I think that they can do as good work, or, of course, that they could if they were as well prepared. Therefore, while they ought to be asked to learn as much as men, they ought not to be asked to learn it as quickly; and they need not be if we intend their education to prepare them for woman's normal life, not for some special kind of money-making. Far from being unlucky as regards possibilities of intellectual cultivation, the women of America seem to me lucky above their brothers. They can develop themselves as individuals without thinking of wage-earning; and if they must develop less quickly, they have time in more than the needful proportion. Nor does this apply merely to the years of early preparation. Even the busy mother of a family, unless she is so poor that all the domestic work falls upon her own hands, has at least as many free hours in the day as her husband; and although her day's work is at least as important and significant as his, it does not exhaust her brain as most kinds of money-making do.

In the women of America, it seems to me, lies the nation's best hope of intellectual advance. Leisure is what is needed for such advance, and our women have this in immeasurably greater degree than our men. Usually they do not turn it to very good account. But is this their fault? Are they a lazy, phlegmatic, unambitious race? Are they not reproached, rather, with great restlessness, with nervous excitability, with a constant desire for something they have not got? And may not this temper simply be a sign, as it so often is with children, of mental activity turning to unrest because there is "nothing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to do"? Give a restless, discontented child an absorbing occupation, and he is quiet and happy enough. Give our restless women disciplined and cultivated minds, spur them by showing that some sort of useful activity is expected of them, make them feel that it is neither delightfully surprising nor absurdly unreasonable, but simply natural and right, that they should wish to be at work, and most of them will become quiet and happy too. It would distress you to have a group of idle sons, thirty or forty years of age, hanging around your home; you would not expect them to be contented, and you would probably blame yourself for having somehow erred in their training. But you like to have a group of idle daughters about you; you think it very strange if they are discontented, and you rarely feel that to them as well as their brothers the real opportunities of life should have been widely opened.

If you had a crippled son who could not go out with his brothers and earn his living, the first task of your life would be to make him as useful and happy as possible at home. Nothing would be spared upon his education; and later you would inconvenience yourself to give him a quiet room to write in, or a chemical laboratory, or even a telescope on the roof. But if your daughter who has chanced not to marry, and upon whom domestic life makes little claim, if she should desire such things, you would think it "unreasonable." You do not want her to go out and earn her living; you simply think that she ought to be content in idleness. Or if, as so often happens (for, as I have said, American women are not lazy in mind or body), she attempts some sort of philanthropic or intellectual work, you are quite content to see her perform it badly for lack of a properly disciplined mind. And yet if some one should ask you whether this daughter were semi-idiotic or excessively stupid, you might assert that she had "a better head" than any of her brothers. You are proud, in a way, of having brought her into the world, and you think you care tenderly for her interests. But while you would never dream of burying a thousand dollars which belonged to her in a hole in the ground or of spending them on your own needs, you have forced her to waste intellectual wealth that she and the world might have enjoyed, and you think of her chiefly as conducing to the pleasures of your own home life.

You have done your duty by your boys because you have helped them to live. You have not done your duty by her because you have simply helped her to exist. You have not helped her to live a real life, to be and do her best either as the mother of a family or as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maiden daughter by your own fireside. Do not say that she showed no desire to be thoroughly educated. Did you ask your boys whether they wanted to be properly prepared for their several careers? Probably at ten years old she was a better student than they. But at fourteen, just when they were made to feel that they would be disgraced if they did not really work, she was made to feel, perhaps, that she might work if she chose, but that if she did not no one would blame her, for no one expected anything serious of her. And later on, if she asked for the higher education, it was begun too late and hurried through too quickly; and if she broke down the fault was laid, not to your initial mistake, but to the essential weakness of the feminine organization. Did all young girls feel about their education as the pressure of public opinion makes all boys feel, were it properly begun at as early an age as it is with boys, and were it systematically pursued in a way adapted to their physical characteristics, they would absorb it as easily, wear it as naturally, profit by it as generally as their brothers; and whatever their future life, whether devoted to the normal tasks of women or to more exceptional intellectual tasks, they would have received the best possible preparation for it.

Of course I do not mean that the higher education would make all women wise and sensible, useful, happy, and charming, or that no woman can be these things without it. I only mean that if it were generally bestowed, all women would be much more likely to achieve such qualities than they are to-day. Nor do I mean that our men have such well-developed minds that our women should merely aspire to equal them. I mean that their minds are, at all events, better developed than their sisters', and that even a realization of equality would vastly profit them as well as their sisters. My plea is, indeed, quite as much for our boys as for our girls, since it is a plea for the improvement of their mothers, sisters, wives, and friends. Those who live to see a class of highly educated women with really "knowing and thinking minds," will see the usefulness and happiness of American men increased as greatly as the usefulness and happiness of American women.

M. G. Van Rensselaer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY WOMEN ARE PAID LESS THAN MEN.

UNTIL within a comparatively recent period, woman's subjection to man has been well-nigh complete in all respects, whether we consider the subjection from a social, a political, an intellectual, or even a physical point of view; but after many years of struggle and the gradual winning of the justice of man, she has fairly achieved her intellectual and her social equality. By this I mean that she has achieved her right to an education and to the development of her intellectual powers and her conventional social equality; for had she achieved her full social equality, there would be no further emancipation to be gained by her. From being the property of man, she emerged, under civilization, from the sphere of the drudge to that of a social power, and consequently to the liberty of cultivating her mental faculties. Her development along these two lines has not been continuous nor contemporaneous in all lands, but it has been persistent and sure. It has not been equal everywhere, for under different civilizations, even of a high order, her status has been different, while only those countries which claim to be in the forefront have recognized a common social standing for her. How, or when, or why the subjection first took shape is a subject very largely for theory only, although the student may believe he has reached the true causes; but to these causes it is not essential at the present time to give any extended consideration.

The social and intellectual emancipation of woman being an established fact, the next emancipation must relate to her industrial status; and whether we approve or disapprove, should industrial equality be secured, political equality must surely follow. Looking the field over carefully, I am inclined to the idea that industrial and political equality will be co-ordinate results, the latter, however, depending upon the former, rather than the reverse. The industrial status of woman and what it means thus attracts me primarily, and claims more immediate consideration than her political status. Speaking broadly, industrial emancipation means the highest type of woman as a result, for the word "industrial" must be used as comprehending all remune-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rative service, including professions as well as the narrower occupations in which stipulated wages are paid for services rendered.

The entrance of woman into the industrial field was assured when the factory system of labor displaced the hand-labor system, for the factory system was concretely the result of the universal tendency to association inherent in our nature, and under the development of which every advance in human improvement and human happiness has been gained. The age of invention must be held accountable for the entrance of woman into a field entirely strange and unknown to her prior to that age; for under the hand-labor system she played little or no part in material production. She was used to home duties, to field drudgeries, and to the work necessary for the assistance of her husband or father in the hand labor which he performed; but under that system she lived a narrow, contracted, unwholesome life in the lower walks of industry, and she was not known or recognized in the higher. As an economic factor, either in art or literature or industry, she was hardly recognizable, although she may have written a book now and then or appeared as a philosopher or as an artist. With the establishment of the new system, the birth of which must be placed between 1760 and 1770, the attraction to woman to earn more than she could earn as a domestic servant or in some fields of agricultural labor, or to earn something where before she had earned nothing, became the economic force which induced her to assume the position and to submit to all the conditions of a new economic factor.

It can hardly be said that in the lower forms of labor in industrial pursuits she superseded man; on the contrary, she supplemented his labor, and the necessities of various people, which could be supplied under the new system of labor, made it possible for her to supplement the services of man; so she entered the factories of old England and of this country when they became established, and did her work in them as well and as quickly as it could be done in certain processes by men. She was paid a lower rate of wage than men, although subsequently men were obliged to take practically the same wage when performing the same duty; but the wages that were paid were not so much lower as it is often supposed they were, when the same lines of duties are considered. In England the intellectual activity introduced by the new system of labor worked changes in the educational condition, and this brought the interest of woman to higher forms of employment; so in this country, from factory employment women entered higher grades, as teachers, book-keepers,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

telegraph-operators, etc.; and as the expertness of women was recognized, the demand for skilled and well-equipped women increased, and this demand was again the result of the absorption of the labor of men in the great developing enterprises of America. This tendency has been noticed in other directions—in reforms, where the reforms grew from the lower toward the higher, and thus the professional field in the broadest sense opened to women all its advantages and opportunities. Yet back of 1860 or thereabouts, the industrial fields open to women were very limited.

A study of census statistics leads to the broad statement, made with almost positive accuracy, that there are but few lines of remunerative employment not now open to woman. She is found in nearly all the departments of governmental work. In professional life, so far as the statistics have been classified for the State of Massachusetts—those for the recent Federal census not being at hand and those for Massachusetts being indicative of conditions in all advanced States—there is hardly a single field where we do not find her occupied, whether we turn to religion, medicine, literature, art, music, the drama, education, or science. Of course she holds the reins in domestic service, while in trade the proportions of female to male labor are respectable. In transportation her services play but a minor part, and this is true of the great industries of agriculture and the fisheries. In manufactures, out of 394,584 persons engaged in all the great industries in 1885, there were 112,762 women and 281,822 men.

Competition has had much to do in bringing the industrial freedom of woman to the status it now occupies. Chivalry and knightly courtesy have not been sufficient; there must be equality of opportunity, equality of respect resulting from independence and capacity, or there cannot be industrial emancipation. Woman has won her way into the ranks of industry in every sphere of remunerative employment. It is therefore logical to inquire, What has been the benefit to her as a matter of pecuniary gain? What is her compensation? Is it fair and just? Is it equal to that paid to men for like services? Very much is said in regard to poorly paid women, and the truth is sufficient to bring the blush to the cheek of the great majority of mankind. But do the facts, so far as statistics are concerned, clearly indicate the real truth? May we not be deceived in some respects? The compensation paid to women in the higher spheres of employment, for professional and semi-professional services, need not cause much anxiety. Singers, artists, and other professional women are probably

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well paid as men; if they are not, their compensation does not excite the sympathy or the interest of the public. I confine myself, therefore, so far as compensation is concerned, to that paid in the lower ranks of employment.

A study of the facts may lead to the conclusion that it is not wholly the reproach of our times that women receive less than men for the same work equally well done; for we may find that for work equally well done they receive about the same pay that men receive. The appearances are against this view, for statistics, without a study of further facts than those relating to actual wages, seem to offer conclusive evidence that they are not paid the same or nearly the same as men are for work equally well performed. Under Federal statistics, wages have never been classified in such way as to be used in illustrating the facts as between women's and men's wages in like employments. We must, therefore, for illustration turn again to the statistics of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as they were collected and reported under the census of 1885, which cover, for purposes of classification, the wages paid to 248,200 employees, including both sexes.

From these we find that 8.99 per cent of all the males employed in the manufacturing and mechanical industries of Massachusetts received less than five dollars per week, 4.85 per cent received five dollars per week but less than six dollars, and 6.77 per cent received six dollars but less than seven dollars per week. These males were principally minors, and they comprised 20.61 per cent, or about one-fifth, of all the males, their average pay being less than one dollar per day. Now, of all females employed, 72 per cent, whether minors or not, are paid similar wages, that is, less than one dollar per day. On the other hand, 11.21 per cent of all males receive nine dollars but less than ten dollars per week, 13.71 per cent ten dollars but less than twelve dollars, 19.37 per cent twelve dollars but less than fifteen dollars, and 19.49 per cent fifteen dollars or over; these males, who comprise 63.78 per cent, or nearly two-thirds, of all males, receive one dollar and a half or more per day. Only 10.26 per cent of the females employed are paid similar wages. The wages of minors and of all females, whether minors or not, approach each other. The medium-wage class, so far as relates to equality of sexes, or that class in which the proportion of each sex receiving specified wages approaches the proportion of all persons employed, receiving the same wages, is that in which the operatives receive eight dollars but less than nine dollars

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per week. In this class are found 7.22 per cent of all males employed, 6.01 per cent of all females employed, and 6.86 per cent of all persons employed without regard to sex. Below this rate of wages the percentage of females in each class rapidly increases, while above it the percentage of females in each class rapidly decreases. The converse is true with respect to males. Many statistics might be cited which would show the same relative positions; but a study of the occupations themselves leads to somewhat different conclusions, for such study indicates that women are not generally occupying positions that men would occupy, or that when occupying like positions their pay approximates that awarded to men.

Women have taken possession of many occupations, and are being paid, as a rule, in accordance with the skill, the talent, or the genius required to fill properly the positions they occupy. If men should perform the same work in these positions, they would probably be paid, if not the same rates of wages, very nearly the same rates, as those paid to women; and in many cases where compensation is by the piece, the rates are the same, whether men or women perform the work, the earnings being in accordance with the skill and the application of the worker. The statistics with regard to the cotton industry of Massachusetts well illustrate this statement. They show that of the 48,178 persons employed, 22,015 are males and 26,163 are females. Of the males 28.61 per cent, and of the females 49.70 per cent, receive less than five dollars per week; 14.47 per cent of the males and 23.94 per cent of the females receive five dollars and less than six dollars per week. When we reach the ordinary compensation of six dollars but less than seven dollars per week, the proportion receiving this is quite equal, it being 13.41 per cent for the males and 15.97 per cent for the females. The proportions then divide, but the figures indicate that a very large number of males who do work precisely like that performed by females are receiving practically the same wages.

It should be remembered that as men have stepped up into higher occupations, those which have come up as new callings in life, they have received comparatively higher compensation than women in the old occupations. The latter have occupied the positions of bookkeepers, telegraphers, and many of what might be called semi-professional callings; and as women have occupied them, men have entered higher callings—engineering, electrical and mechanical, and other spheres of life that were not known when women first stepped into the industrial field. As women have progressed from entire want of em-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ployment to employment which pays a few dollars per week, men, too, have progressed in their employments and occupied entirely new fields not known before. It is not quite true, therefore, to say that in occupations where women do like work with men they are not paid equal wages when the work is equally well done. I have known young women book-keepers to receive much higher pay, after a very short apprenticeship, than was awarded to the men they had superseded. In the clerkships in the departments at Washington there is no distinction by sex as to compensation. A woman employed in a first-class clerkship or any other grade receives the same pay that is given to a man. She may not be able as a rule to secure so high a clerkship as a man, but when she does she receives precisely the same salary as the man receives, and works by his side. Notwithstanding these statements, the very low pay of women in many directions excites sympathy and discussion, and all should join in the effort to bring her wages up to a higher level.

But there are potent and logical reasons why women are employed at so low a rate which cannot be overcome by any considerations, either social, or economic, or legislative. These considerations are interesting, and account conclusively for the present status of affairs relative to women's wages. The reasons are as follows:[1]

Firstly, stepping out of industrial subjection and general subjection to man, woman comes into the industrial system of the present as an entirely new economic factor. If there were no other reasons, this alone would be sufficient to keep her wages low and to prevent their very rapid increase.

Secondly, woman occupies a lower standard, which is caused to some extent by a lower standard of life, both in physical features and in mental demands. She is also the victim of the influence of the assistance which she receives in a large proportion of cases from her family and friends. This lowers her economic standard to a great degree, while the lack of physical endurance interferes with her industrial productivity and compels her to stand upon a lower plane in this respect than does man. This reason acts strongly, not only upon quantity, but upon quality of work performed.

Thirdly, she receives low wages through an insufficient equipment for life-work, which is not the result of incapacity of mind or lack of skill, but is due largely to the hope that the permanence of

[1] *Cf.* "The Alleged Differences in the Wages of Men and Women," by Sidney Webb: "The British Economic Journal," December, 1891.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work will be interrupted by matrimony. Inferior work is often the direct result of the same hope; the one is the sure complement of the other. The lack of technical training, from which training she has shrunk, has caused her to occupy an inferior position, or rather to remain in such position. She does not feel warranted in spending years, if required, in equipping herself for the best service, and this is true to some extent in the higher grades of employment now sought by woman. This, in conjunction with another fact, largely accounts for her low remuneration in general. The other fact is that when occupying a good position she does not always fill it with the same assiduity that accompanies a man's service. She has not the responsibilities, either of family or of society, to lead her ambition to secure the best results, and she is not, therefore, stimulated by the powerful forces which stimulate a man to do his best in whatever line he finds his life cast.

Fourthly, woman has lacked, so far, the influence which comes from combination and association. She works in an individual capacity and with the weakness of individual effort. She has not learned the power of combining her forces, nor the powerful influence which comes from combination, as men have done. Furthermore, she has not been a political factor in society. She has had no influence except as the influence of men has helped her, and this has been often too selfish to be of any practical benefit to her. Competition, profit, and business success are far more powerful than any sentiment or any feeling of knightly chivalry. This position is well illustrated by the movements in England and in this country to reduce the hours of labor. Long before any legislation took place fixing the hours in certain industries at ten or less, in those industries where men solely or principally were employed the hours had been ten or less. It took legislation, positive enactment, and the power of government to bring the hours of labor of women and children to an equality with those of men. The lack of direct political influence must be considered as constituting a powerful reason why woman's wages have been kept at the minimum.

Fifthly, as woman has come into the industrial field as a new economic factor, the pressure to secure positions in that field has created a supply altogether out of proportion to the demand, and thus every position which she might occupy is sought by many, so that her remuneration is within the power of the employer.

If I am asked how the relative inferiority of woman to man in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industrial matters is to be overcome and a perfect or approximate equality reached, I confess that I cannot answer, except in the most general way and along lines which seem to permit me simply to use platitudes. The growing importance of woman's labor, her general equipment through technical education, her more positive dedication to the life-work she chooses, the growing sentiment that an educated and skilful woman is a better and truer life companion than an ignorant and unskilful one, her appreciation of combination, and the general uplifting of the sentiment of integrity in business circles, her gradual approach to man's powers in mental work, her possible political influence—all these combined, working along general avenues of progress and of evolution, will bring her industrial emancipation, by which she will stand, in those callings in life for which she may be fitted, on an equality with man. As she approaches this equality, her remuneration will be increased and her economic importance acknowledged.

With the success of woman in industrial matters, what will be the results to her individually, to society, and to man as her companion and friend? These are important questions, perhaps far more important than any of the economic features we have been discussing. It is perfectly evident that woman is in open rebellion against the traditional curse and against the doctrine of the Pauline estimate of woman's sphere, that she has determined to assert her equality in many directions, and that she has entered and occupied the great field of remunerative employment to such an extent as to demand her recognition as an important economic factor. The purely productive field, economically speaking, claimed her first attention; next, the whole sphere of educational work. As a teacher her power is unquestioned. In the professions public opinion recognizes and indorses her occupancy, while in the arts and sciences she securely holds her position. We all know the extent of the industrial emancipation, how far it has reached, and what woman has accomplished under it. We may have our fears as to its tendencies, and some may have prophetic vision as to what complete industrial emancipation will lead to.

Although not gifted with prophecy, I am fond of studying conditions, and I find in such study that it is quite impossible to draw a clear line of demarcation between what actually exists and continuing existence; so in what I have to say about the condition of woman, as worked out so far by her, I am much inclined to project my thought

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into continuing conditions. I am inclined to believe that the industrial freedom of woman will tend temporarily to a decrease in the marriage rate and an increase in the divorce rate; but this should not frighten us in the least. As woman has the power given her to support herself, she will be less inclined to seek marriage relations simply for the purpose of securing what may seem to be a home and protection. The necessity under which many young women live, of looking to marriage as a freedom from the bondage of some kinds of labor, tends, in my mind, to the worst form of prostitution that exists. I cannot see much difference between a woman who sells her whole freedom and her soul to a man for life because he furnishes her with certain conveniences and one who sells her temporary freedom and her soul for a temporary remuneration, except in this, that the former may be worse than the latter. If a woman has the opportunity of supporting herself honorably while she is developing her intellectual and spiritual faculties, she is more likely to seek or to accept marriage relations which depend upon the purest and highest elements of companionship.

So while divorces may grow temporarily more frequent and marriages less frequent as the industrial emancipation of woman progresses to completeness, the purity and the sacredness and the happiness of married life must be correspondingly increased, and the result must be that marriage will take place only when companionship in the holiest sense is intended. Industrial independence which will secure such results must lead to the recruiting of the human race from the best elements, instead of from the lowest, as is now so largely the case. If there is any value in these suggestions, then the family, as the resultant of marriage, will be placed upon a more enduring basis than that on which it now stands; it will be more sacred, because it will be less irritating. If marriage is to be purer and the family more sacred, with woman occupying an exalted position as to remunerative service, the morals of the community must be correspondingly enhanced.

I know very well that many writers would not agree with what I have said, and there is even now a sharp and critical contest with regard to this subject going on which is attracting public attention. Perhaps the most brilliant warfare in this direction is that which has taken place, and may be continued, between Mr. Frederic Harrison, one of the leaders of the positivists in England, and Mrs. Millicent Fawcett. Mrs. Fawcett has no fears of the great evil which Mr. Har-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rison predicts as a result of the emancipation of woman, which emancipation she does not hesitate to say is the result of woman's entrance upon industrial pursuits. She believes that many of the shipwrecks of domestic happiness which most people can call to mind have been caused by the wife having no real vocation for the duties and responsibilities of marriage, or from her having married without deep affection for her husband, simply because she felt it was a chance she ought not to miss of what is euphemistically called "settling herself in life." Mrs. Fawcett thinks evil conditions are induced by lack of industrial independence, and that it is hardly too much to say that it is not till women have had an opportunity of working for wages outside the home that the value of their work in the home receives the recognition it deserves.

It must be true that woman will secure the extension of her opportunities for intellectual work. She may know now everything that a man may learn; she may reach any intellectual height; she may place her name as high as that of any man. Her economic freedom will stimulate the introduction of some convenient system of living by which she can rid herself, if she choose, of the drudgery of household work without destroying the home, and thereby gain time and opportunity for individual improvement, for the cultivation of her best talents, and for bestowing the highest care upon the rearing of her children. She will secure, as the direct result of industrial emancipation, her absolute social equality, and this will warrant her in making great changes in her whole environment, whether these changes be of dress, of amusement, of avocation, or of political action. Social equality will not, as Mr. Harrison predicts, warrant her in making a fool of herself, but it will enable her to step out from under the restraining conditions which prevent her from taking the wisest individual action. It is not fair to predict that though now the most active element of all church organization and of the highest forms of charity service, in the forefront of moral reforms, with still greater powers, with still further development, she is going to act unwisely. I believe she will act wisely and demonstrate her right to the industrial emancipation which is to place her on true social equality with man. With such social equality her loveliness will become more lovely, she will make man's life happier and better, and with increased influence over his intellectual being, she will lead him to higher attainments, and with her intense psychic force she will be able to become a power in the world that we have not yet fully seen nor yet fully comprehended.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And if all this leads to what many are pleased to call equal political rights, we cannot quarrel with it.

It is not just that all other advantages which may come through industrial emancipation be withheld simply because one great privilege on which there is a division of sentiment may also come. One of the greatest boons, and one of the surest prophecies which can be offered as the result of the industrial emancipation of woman, will be the frank admission on the part of the true and chivalric man that she is the sole, rightful owner of her own being in every respect, and that whatever companionship may exist between her and man shall be as thoroughly honorable to her as to him. She will enter upon organized work in the future, and this will be ethical, as it has been in the past when she has attempted organized effort; but the essential feature will be perfection in skill, dedication to calling, integrity of service, and the use of her mind under conditions which have brought success to her father and her brother. She will enter chiefly those branches of industry where women by experience are found to surpass men, and in those, high or low, she will ultimately hold the sway. In callings where men surpass women, the woman will be obliged to abandon the field; but where duties are performed with equal skill and integrity by both, there will come honest competition and an equalization of compensation.

So in her political ambition she must be content to stand or fall by the same rule. If she bungles, political emancipation will not come. If her experiments prove successful, she will secure political freedom, no matter what the arguments may be against it. In all respects I bespeak for the great influence which shall come from the industrial emancipation of woman a happier and purer social condition; and this I say, not as an advocate of woman suffrage, not as woman's champion, but simply from recognizing justice and from the inevitable trend of social forces which is hastened by industrial processes.

CARROLL D. WRIGHT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DOES THE NEGRO PAY FOR HIS EDUCATION?

THREE things are noted as making it hard for the South to support public schools: the large ratio of children to parents, the scarcity of taxable property, and the sparseness of population. Some add a fourth; that is, State debts. Now, the practical question in the mind of every public-spirited Southerner ought, it seems to me, to be: Do these things so fully account for and so unavoidably control the present status of Southern public schools that it is useless to look or strive for better conditions while these four things remain as they are, or are the present starved conditions of these schools due in part to other obstructions removable, but largely overlooked?

Probably the answer comes easiest in regard to State debts. Alabama, poorer in net wealth than North Carolina, and South Carolina, poorer still, both provide better for public education than North Carolina does; while Arkansas, with twice the debt and little better than equal wealth *per capita* of minors, provides twice as well. Mississippi, the State of least wealth in the Union, excels five of the eleven southernmost States in yearly school provision *per capita* of her population, and yet is excelled by Arkansas, almost as poor and with two and a half times as much debt. So, then, State debts do not explain contrasts in school outlays. It may be well, therefore, for those who feel interested to look inquiringly at the other obstacles.

Both in the North and in the South, men whose integrity and generosity are beyond a moment's question have drawn comparisons between very rich and populous States of the North and very poor and thinly-settled States of the South, which have been only the more unfortunate for the Southern States because they flattered them. North Carolina, they say, spent lately in one year a larger ratio of her scant wealth for public education than did Massachusetts, which is seven times as rich per inhabitant. One who has gone no further than this comparison may be surprised to know that Utah, much more like the South in the summing up of her economic conditions than any Eastern State is, spends yearly for schools three and a half times as much *per capita* as the Carolinas, and has provided a public-school

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

property whose cash value *per capita* of her school attendance is fourteen times that of South Carolina, and nearly one and a half times that of all the eleven southernmost States combined. But such comparisons are unfair, whether they flatter or condemn, because the opposite regions are too dissimilar for close comparisons. Strange that so few seem to have thought of the far greater value of comparing one Southern State with another. Surely this is one good way to find out whether or not the South is "doing all it can" for public education.

Let us see: The Carolinas are about equal in wealth,[1] in outlays for public schools, and in the ratio of children aged from six to fourteen years. Arkansas is poorer, has more children, and is not half as thickly settled. And yet by every proportion Arkansas spends for schools nearly twice as much as either of the Carolinas. Neither Tennessee nor any seaboard State from Virginia to Texas spends so much yearly in proportion to wealth *per capita* as Arkansas, whose wealth *per capita* is the least in the United States. Every one of these States ought to be doing better than Arkansas, or else there are other causes hindering them that ought to be better known. We shall look for these presently. Meantime, is Arkansas a safe standard for other States? Is Arkansas, less than two-thirds of whose two hundred and seventy-five thousand children[2] are enrolled in schools and with less than one-half in daily attendance, doing all she can?

Here we have to look beyond the South for comparisons; but let us look no farther than we must, avoiding violent contrasts in the three conditions already in view, and looking to those Northern States that in these conditions are nearest like the South. These are some four or five large States of the middle West just beyond the Mississippi and surrounding and including Iowa. Iowa has a density of population and ratio of children to adults about the same as that of the Carolinas. Her wealth[1] is twice that of Arkansas, but is less than that of Texas. Yet her annual school outlay[2] is nearly three times that of Texas and over five times that of Arkansas. Kansas is not quite so rich as Iowa. Her ratio of children is about the same. Yet in 1888–89 she spent for public schools seven times as much[2] as Georgia, or the sum total of the *per capitas* of Georgia and the five States by which Georgia is bounded. Other comparisons show similar contrasts; scantiness of population, low ratios of wealth, and high ratios of minors to adults fail to explain why Southern public

[1] *Per capita* of total population.
[2] *Per capita* of population six to fourteen years old.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

education stands where it does. Is it not high time to ask what there may be peculiar in the Southern methods of raising school funds? Where do and where should these funds come from in the South?

It sounds trite to say that neither in the South nor elsewhere need one ever expect to find an adequate free-school system that is not mainly supported by taxes on property and recognized by the property-holder himself as an investment so profitable to him that he cannot honestly count it a charity or a sacrifice. But we need to ask, Does this burden rest on the property-holder more heavily or more lightly in Southern than in other States of like population and wealth; and, especially, does property pay an unusually large or an unusually small share of the whole fund? The answer will surprise most readers. It is that in the eleven southernmost States the tax on property furnishes a smaller proportion of the whole free-school fund than it does elsewhere in America. In Kansas or Iowa it is from three to eleven times as heavy [1] as in any Southern State, and rests upon the property-holder with an exclusiveness absolutely unknown in the South. What offsets, we have to ask, are there for this shortcoming?

One, a partial one, is the poll tax. The strong expediency of a poll tax for schools in the South has been recognized by both races and all classes ever since the State constitutions of 1868 established public education. No one has ever opposed it, and the only question has been and is, What part of the whole tax ought the poll tax to be? Massachusetts levies a poll tax; but it is only one-fourteenth of the whole school revenue. A poll tax would hardly be felt if added to or taken from the school funds of Iowa or Kansas; but these States lay no poll tax at all. In South Carolina the whole yearly revenue for public schools is barely two dollars per male adult. The poll tax is one dollar, legally due from every man not a pauper or a vagabond. It goes into the school fund. Duly collected, it ought therefore to make half the present fund. In Alabama the poll tax is one dollar and a half. Thoroughly gathered in, it would make two-thirds the present yearly school outlay. But the whole system of school revenues and outlays is so ordered that in the non-collection of the poll taxes the poorest poor, white and black, are the principal sufferers—by hundreds of thousands. In Alabama and Georgia the State school tax on property is limited by their constitutions to a hopelessly insufficient rate, and the counties are forbidden, except on permission of the legislature, to add to it a local tax. In the towns and cities of al-

[1] *Per capita* of total population.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most all the South this local tax is much resorted to; in the country districts it is not; and in Alabama, for instance, the poor farm tenants' swarms of children get only a *pro rata* of the State's diminutive school tax on property and as much poll tax, distributed not *pro rata*, but strictly within race lines, as their largely destitute, ignorant, crop-mortgaged fathers will pay without much urging. And yet the poll tax collected in Alabama in 1889–90 was nearly half as much as the State school tax on property. The differences in other Southern States are only of degree. Out of the South there is no State whose non-property-holder pays so large a share of the whole school tax as the "poor white" and the Negro pay in the South, or in which, for other men's children, the payer of school taxes on property pays so little.

Now, whether this be wise or unwise, the capriciousness with which the poll tax is here gathered and there left ungatherd is certainly unfortunate. In South Carolina, in 1888–89, Charleston, city and county, contributing and consuming one-fifth of the whole public-school fund of the State, collected from among twenty thousand taxable polls only fourteen hundred and twenty-three dollars poll tax. Yet four other counties, two of them with large colored majorities, paid in poll taxes almost half their total school funds, and seventeen others with colored majorities and four with white paid in poll taxes over one-half as much as in taxes on property. In North Carolina the poll tax is two dollars per male adult, and every man, with or without property, who pays his poll tax pays for schools four-fifths of all he would pay if the school tax were wholly on property and he owned the average wealth. We see, then, not only that in the South the very poor man is already paying a far larger share of the expense of public schools than he pays in any other country, but that he would be paying much more than he does if, with general efficiency, the tax were collected which he is legally required to pay. At the same time property is constitutionally protected from the rate of taxation for schools which it cheerfully consents to bear in all other enlightened lands. "According to resources and population, Georgia," says, officially, one of her own school commissioners, "has as small a school fund as any civilized state on which the sun shines." In 1889–90 her total public-school revenue was some $826,600, not half of which was tax on private property. However, one question still demands a clearer answer: Does the Negro pay for his education? Are these conditions as true, in the South, of the Negro in particular as of the poor man in general? For the Negro, of course, is very poor. White

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men, we are told, own ninety-one and one-half per cent of all the taxable property in the South. What, then, does the Negro pay?

One of Georgia's ablest educators and noblest citizens tells us that from 1865 to January 1, 1889, the Southern States paid out over thirty-seven million dollars for the education of the colored race. But, as some one has wittily said, we must not use the numerators of statistics without their denominators. Even though this outlay had been all made within the last fifteen years, it would be only about one dollar and a half yearly *per capita* of the colored school population in the eleven States expending it; less than one-tenth the *per capita* spent by Dakota in the year 1887–88 on her children of school age. If Georgia is a fair example of these eleven States, not half this outlay was tax on property. Though 47 per cent of the people are colored, the colored schools, says her State commissioner, get only about 30 per cent of the yearly school fund. So, then, as half the fund is not tax on property, and the colored schools do not get even one-third the fund, whatever the Negro's education may cost the white man, it costs the white man's private property nothing. But the official reports of Georgia for 1889–90 discover still more:

Thirty per cent of the school fund that year, the share allowed the colored schools, was.....		$248,000
One item of school revenue was half the rental of a "State railroad." There was also a railroad dividend; the two amounting to $150,000. Forty-seven per cent of the people of Georgia are colored. In all free countries such earnings of the public wealth as these are regarded as owned by the whole people equally, rich and poor, high and low. They are as truly and largely the products of labor as of capital. Yet if we credit the Negro with but twenty-five instead of forty-seven per cent here, still his share would be.	$38,010	
The poll tax collected from colored men was.....	101,920	
Their forty-seven per cent of the school revenues from the tax on liquor dealers, hire of convicts, tax on shows, etc., was.	52,640	
The taxes collected on property owned by colored people were..	16,430	
This shows that nearly the whole colored class pay no direct tax on property. But if on account of the partial "movability" of taxes from landlord to tenant, merchant to customer, etc., we credit the Negro with but one scant twenty-fifth of the State's one and a third million of annual taxes, it suffices to cover his account here, being.....	39,000	
		$248,000

Thus easily is the account squared. If the Negro does not complain of such bookkeeping, certainly no one else can. The least that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be said is that in the year 1889–90 the colored schools of Georgia did not really cost the white people of the State, as a whole, a single cent, either in poll tax, tax on property, or any other form of public revenue. In the other ten southernmost States the case is not seriously different. The true explanation of the present melancholy condition of public education in them is not their public debts, nor the slenderness of private wealth, nor their large ratio of children, nor thinness of population, though all these have their partial effects. The true explanation lies in the laws and methods under which their school funds are gathered and disbursed. What is said here is but a hint—one item—of what might be shown; but it may suffice for the time, since it shows that the Negro, so far from being the educational pauper he is commonly reputed to be, comes, in those States, nearer to paying entirely for his children's schooling, such as it is, than any similarly poor man in any other part of the enlightened world.

I beg to offer my recognition of the fact that my having been born in the South and having passed the first forty years of my life there is no sufficient guaranty against my making mistakes about Southern affairs. Probably my chances of error are reduced by the fact that subsequently I have seen and studied every other part of the Union. And yet it may be as well to add that I got all my early schooling in the public schools of a Southern State, that throughout the period of reconstruction and for many years afterward I was a sympathetic and minute observer at close range of the fortunes of public education in the South, and that I am and always have been a careful student of the invaluable annual reports of the national commissioners of education.

I have shown that sparseness of population, scarcity of taxable wealth, the weight of public debts, large ratios of children to adults, and the burden of the Negro as a consumer of school taxes levied on other men's property do not, all together, furnish nearly that full explanation of the forlorn state of Southern free schools they are commonly supposed to do. The Negro pays a larger proportion of his whole school fund than any poor man out of the South in America; while as for the other four drawbacks, Arkansas, the most heavily burdened by them, stands first among the eleven southernmost States in the ratio of her yearly school outlays to her wealth. I propose next more fully to show that a far more potent cause is the peculiar laws and methods under which Southern public-school funds are raised and disbursed, and especially those which almost totally deprive the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country schools of aid from cities and towns and even of the liberty of self-help.

In all lands, cities and towns spend more on the school-child than the country does. Yet not in all items; tuition often costs less. If we instance certain Northern States nearest like the South in population, wealth, and ratio of children to parents, Kansas, for tuition, spends $9.50 per child in her cities and large towns and $10.03 in the rest of the State. Iowa shows about the same proportion. But the value, per child, of her school property is about twice as much in her towns of 4,000 inhabitants and over as it is in her lesser towns and the country, and in Kansas it is exactly twice as much. Yet in these States the country pupils enjoy a school property equal in value to about $30 each.

Now, in Arkansas the cash value of all public-school property [1] is less than one-tenth that of Kansas, one-thirteenth that of Iowa, and one-fifteenth that of Nebraska, and yet more than one-half of it is confined to the use of one-twenty-second part of the school population. Less than 13,000 town children enjoy a provision of nearly $45 each, while over twenty times that number, in the country, are limited to less than $1.50 each. In eight Alabama towns, in 1888–89, less than 23,000 children enjoyed the school property of the State at the rate of over $15 per child, while 352,000 shared the remainder at 42½ cents each. And in the South these States are not exceptional. Or if we look at yearly outlays, we find that in Georgia, for instance, five cities, including Atlanta, raise for public schools nearly eight times as much by local as by State taxation, one result of which is that in 1889–90 over 515,000 country children, between six and eighteen years of age, had to get their year's schooling out of $1.25 each. Of course, many got nothing; but 35,600 town children got two-fifths of all the year's fund. In Alabama the country children's *per-capita* share of the year's running expenses (1887–88) was less than one-tenth that of the children in the cities and towns.

Even in the cities and towns this extraordinary and unfortunate inequality of distribution continues; but there it is mainly between the two races that make up their populations. In Birmingham, Alabama, 45 per cent of the school-census enumeration, or 39 per cent of the average attendance, is colored; yet the teachers of colored schools get only 22 per cent of the amount paid to teachers. In Montgomery, in 1889–90, the disproportions were still greater. If we

[1] *Per capita* of children of school age.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

go back to the country, we find the same inequities of distribution according to race. Southern colored populations of school age generally show larger ratios of non-enrolment and non-attendance than the white. Unequal expenditures themselves induce unequal enrolments and attendance. The forlorn poverty of country school-houses is the commonest complaint of those men between the millstones, the Southern State superintendents. They have never complained or had cause to complain that colored children did not fill any comfortable, well-equipped school-house provided for them, and until they do, the only fair division of school funds between classes set apart by law is *pro rata* of their total populations of school age. But in most, if not all, the eleven southernmost States the equal division, *pro rata*, between the races, of school funds, is limited to the small fraction of it raised by State taxation.

Statistics tell little of any unequal enjoyment of country school property by the separated races. The reason is simple: there is almost no provision, from State funds, of school property for either race. In cities and towns local taxation is the main resource. In the country private subscriptions do the poor little that is done, and the white poor man is generally left largely, the Negro totally, to his own resources; the colored churches are of a sort that even Negro children cannot damage or disorder, and the teacher and the State get them rent-free. But as to the partition of yearly running expenses we have some positive and surprising arithmetic. Some Southern States pay the same average salary to the teachers of colored as of white rural schools. Here, at furthest, the equality ends. In 1889–90 Alabama employed 5,916 school teachers. On the basis of total school population, her white children, $56\frac{6}{10}$ per cent of all, should have had 780 more teachers than the colored children had. But they had these and 1,200 more, besides. If we represent this undue excess in the pay of these teachers, it was a little over ninety thousand dollars. The total undue excess of teachers and teachers' pay allotted to white public schools in the eleven southernmost States, over those given to colored, amounts annually to over a million dollars, or about half a million more than their true share. In fact, most of these States enforce no equal distribution of any school funds, except of the small fraction of them that passes through the State treasuries. Even the poll tax is sometimes, as in Alabama, divided, not *pro rata*, but only in the proportion in which the two races pay it; or, as in South Carolina, its non-payment works disfranchisement. And thus, to the same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spirit that makes this partition by race, the temptation is held wide open to neglect the collection of this tax from the Negro, who in his desire for education first laid it on his own bare head in the days of reconstruction.

And to what advantage anywhere are these inequitable divisions of school funds? If they were all truly shared *pro rata*, the three millions of Southern white children would nowhere be poorer in teachers or schools because the two millions of colored children were made richer. The seeming loss would but enrich all. Who fancies otherwise forgets our common human nature. There has never been a spot in all the South where the Negro's child was so well supplied that the white child was not soon supplied with as good or better. It is black illiteracy that fosters white illiteracy. Whatever school facilities the Negro by any means acquires, the white man will always have something better, and it will as surely be better for all as it will be more noble for the white man, when he maintains his easy superiority with nothing less than a full *pro-rata* distribution of all funds raised for public education. For lack of it, hundreds of thousands of poor children, white and black, are now out of school, and other hundreds of thousands get wretched schooling instead of good.

There is no room here to more than allude to the unfortunate statutes and State-constitutional articles which, after weaning the public school from the State treasury, incite its own county and township to let it starve. Texas has a school-district optional system so framed as to be simply a landholders' option, and as late as 1887–88 only three hundred of the State's three thousand school districts imposed local school taxes. In Georgia, only the legislature can authorize a county or town to make laws to tax itself, on property, for public schools, and "no such laws shall take effect until . . . approved by a two-thirds vote of persons qualified to vote," and "the General Assembly may prescribe who shall vote on such question."

Here, then, is a much larger cause of the poverty of Southern country schools than all the familiarly assigned causes put together. It is the policy of throwing the support of public schools mainly upon local taxation, and then besetting the local taxation with obstructions and interdictions. The first part of it is not exclusively a Southern policy; several Northern States lean more or less upon local taxation. But the practice is much condemned everywhere, and it is acutely bad for present Southern conditions. In States where every county and township looks upon the public school as the corner-stone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of public order and wealth, it makes far less matter whether the public school lives mainly by State or by local taxation. But in the South there is, first, a wide oversight of the great advantage to the rich in the free education of the poor, and, secondly, a wide difference of wealth between the laboring and property-holding classes, a difference due, not to any great wealth of the rich, but to the abject poverty of the poor. Thus the every-county-for-itself policy becomes a policy of every township, every district, and at last of every *coterie* and even family for itself, and in countless vast rural districts of the South the public and the private schools are barely strong enough to throttle each other. The policy becomes a devil-take-the-hindmost policy, and he takes the children of the poll-taxed Negro and white "cracker" and mountaineer by hundreds of thousands.

I believe I am here presenting indisputable facts; and not merely facts, but—what is of far more importance—the truth. Whatever the truth is, I believe it is best to know the truth, best for all, best that all know it, and that all of it is better than any part of it.

G. W. Cable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. HARRISON'S SOUND ADMINISTRATION.

I AM requested to set forth in a brief space a sketch of the work of the Republican party during the three years of President Harrison's administration, and to discuss his renomination. The two parties are approaching the great quadrennial battle. The first and natural impulse is to consider the character of each of those parties. That is not to be ascertained alone from its professions and promises, but must rest mainly upon what it has done, and it cannot rest upon an old record. It is also true that we have no way of judging the future but by the past.

The Republican party comes to the crisis with its usual abundant pride in a noble past and its high purposes for the future. During the last thirty years it has underlaid the very foundations of our Government, perfected the Constitution, destroyed secession, destroyed slavery, established universal suffrage and equal civil rights, given free the public lands to the actual settler, drawn from foreign nations acknowledgments of the full American citizenship of our adopted fellow-citizens, reduced by $2,000,000,000 the great national debt, established a national currency, applied to the Indian the treatment due him from a Christian democracy, bestowed unprecedented relief upon the disabled soldier and his widow and his orphans, and put into vigorous practice the legitimate doctrines of protection, building up a national self-dependence with astonishing success; in short, in every imaginable field of governmental activity erecting monuments of wise legislation. During the last thirty-one years the Republican party has never entirely lost control of the Government. Under partial defeat it preserved what it had placed in the Constitution and laws, and even made progress under a Democratic presidency. There has been an incessant and fierce opposition to every successive step from 1855 to this day. Yet whatever principle or policy it has placed upon the statute-books has become permanent there. Sooner or later the Democratic party, however unwillingly, has accepted the inevitable.

The Democratic party has never attempted to restore slavery, revive the doctrine of secession, restore the restrictions upon universal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suffrage and equal rights, abolish the national banking system, or repeal the homestead laws. Denouncing protection without stint, it has but once made a serious attempt to formulate a tariff of its own, and then it marched to defeat on the Mills bill. In the great field of finance, after a generation of criticism and stubborn resistance, when Mr. Cleveland became President, he called to the Treasury an Albany banker who followed in the lines of his Republican predecessors, with just erroneous exceptions enough to emphasize his general concurrence. The Democracy has been a party of negation and opposition, herding together a combination of incongruous isms. We cannot clearly foresee what we shall be fighting against, but we know what we shall fight. The Republican party never evades or disguises.

The uppermost subject in the coming campaign will be the doctrines of protection and free trade, but the platform of the Democracy will permit the free-trader and the protectionist to stand together in denouncing the existing tariff, with the certainty, should the party succeed, of falling apart in the construction of a bill. The same Solid South that governed the pseudo-Democracy before the war has nominated the man it thinks most likely to win, knowing that he will stand for that Solid South in its reactionary and unconstitutional treatment of the race question; and while they hold all other questions secondary to that, they will feel sure that the nominee will recognize the iron-bound mass of Southern electoral votes from fifteen States that puts him in place and will obey the majority of his party. A candidate "better than his party" is necessary for the Democracy before an election, but he will be false to his party if he plays the *rôle* afterward. Somebody will be misled. The unanimous Solid South never has been misled save when it believed that the subservient Northern Democracy could prevent the forcible suppression of the Rebellion.

Let me hastily recapitulate some of the most important points in Mr. Harrison's administration:

Seldom, since the Government was organized, has an administration been brought to deal with so many and such grave foreign questions. The Samoan affair involved a preponderance of influence throughout the vast regions of the Pacific Ocean. Great Britain and Germany had been competing for the appropriation of the many islands of that ocean, and sometimes with light regard to the rights of individuals and little respect for the interests of other nations. They met opposition in Samoa from the United States, not in a matter of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

territorial aggrandizement, for the United States has steadily resisted temptations of that character, but respecting the individual rights and commercial privileges of American citizens. The discussion dragged languidly through the administration of President Cleveland, but within a few months after the inauguration of President Harrison, owing to the prompt and firm measures adopted, the dispute was settled in such a manner as to secure for the United States great prestige among European nations and respect for American rights throughout the Pacific.

The Barrundia affair with Guatemala and the troubles growing out of the Chilian civil war afforded the administration an opportunity to define our relations with neighbors sometimes turbulent and revolutionary in such a manner as to insure for our flag greater respect in future, and to convince them of our hearty disposition to treat them with justice and forbearance.

The lynching of the Italians at New Orleans raised complexed and delicate questions involving the responsibility of the Federal Government to foreign treaty powers for the lax administration of justice by State authorities. If the Federal Executive had been disposed to shield itself by the restrictions which the Constitution imposed upon it in its relations to the States of the Union (which relations the President ably stated), the justification for such a course was to be found in the precedents of the State Department. But in his annual message the President frankly acknowledged the flagrant and disgraceful character of the outrage, and plainly intimated that if justice was not administered by the State authorities the Federal Government would not evade its treaty or international obligations. It is greatly to the credit of Mr. Harrison that his sense of justice and humanity and his courage impelled him to vindicate the honor of the country by an act of reparation to Italy in no wise humiliating, but approved by every respectable citizen of the Republic.

The Behring Sea dispute was another inheritance from the Cleveland administration, and might have been satisfactorily settled but for the vacillating policy pursued. This cost the Government millions of dollars and put in peril a great and a valuable industry. Canada, often a disturbing element in our relations with Great Britain, was in this instance the prime cause of the trouble that threatened the peace of the two great nations. It was not until President Harrison took the matter in charge with a firm hand in dispatches of great vigor and frankness that Great Britain assented to an agreement to settle the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions by arbitration, and in the mean while to put a stop to the slaughter of the great herds of seals. And in the event of an adverse decision upon the technical questions of jurisdiction, Great Britain has honorably bound herself to agree upon some measure of effectual protection.

In these matters of foreign concern, without a single exception, the language and conduct of the administration, frank, manly, and vigorous, have been not only enthusiastically approved by the Republicans, but, to a great and most gratifying degree, have been heartily commended by patriotic Americans of all parties.

The conduct of our national finances has been vigorous and successful. Upon the first of March, 1889, practically the beginning of the Harrison administration, the interest-bearing debt amounted to $844,106,220 of four and four and a half per cent bonds, bearing an annual interest charge of $34,578,459.80. The prices of these bonds were very high, owing to purchases made by the preceding administration and an expectation of its continuance. The available cash balance was more than $172,000,000, of which $48,000,000 was on deposit in national banks. Secretary Windom so managed these balances that during his first sixteen months he bought over $78,000,000 of four per cents and $54,000,000 of four and a half per cents at constantly declining prices. In the summer of 1889 the unfavorable condition of trade and finance abroad brought about a stringency in money, relieved by the disbursement of $102,000,000 in the purchase of bonds and prepayment of interest. In 1891 the right to redeem four and a half per cents accrued, and the option was so used in refunding that there are now outstanding but $25,000,000 of said bonds bearing interest at two per cent, the lowest rate among nations. During the last three years the Treasury has reduced the public debt $259,093,650, disbursing therefor $296,316,931.20. Reckoning principal and interest to maturity, the saving by such purchases is over $55,000,000.

The annual interest charge March 1, 1889, was $34,578,459.80. June 1, 1892, it amounted to $22,893,881.20, a decrease of $11,684,578.60—a fraction more than 33⅓ per cent. The volume of money in circulation has within three years been brought up to $1,620,010,229, an increase of $215,804,333, a gain *per capita* of $1.74. During the last three years of Mr. Cleveland's administration the increase was only $84,699,446, a *decrease per capita* of 13 cents. The $48,000,000 of public money which the Cleveland administration had put on de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posit in the national banks has been carefully withdrawn and reduced by judicious expenditures to $13,886,270.13.

During the last three years our exports of merchandise aggregated $2,721,251,195, an annual average of over $907,000,000. During the corresponding three years of the Cleveland administration our exports aggregated $2,159,343,289, an annual average of over $700,000,000. The exports during the Republican three years exceeded the other aggregate by $561,907,906, an annual average excess of $187,000,000. Continuing the comparison of three-year periods, the imports of the last three years amount to the value of $2,440,053,828, and during three years of the Cleveland administration to $2,130,358,910. During the Cleveland three years the excess of exports over imports amounted to $28,984,379. The like excess during the past three years aggregated $281,197,367. The total foreign trade (imports and exports combined) during the three years ending March 31, 1889, was $4,289,702,199. During the last three years it was $5,161,305,023, an excess in favor of the Republican years of $871,602,824. During Cleveland's last twelve months free imports amounted to $254,294,233, or 34.65 per cent of the total imports for the period. During the corresponding twelve months ending March 31, 1892, the value of free imports amounted to $461,473,523, constituting 55.13 per cent of the total imports. This growth in free imports consists partly of such articles as coffee, tea, sugar, and the like, entering into the daily consumption of the people and to a small extent in competition with our own productions. Free-traders cry for increased foreign trade, and are willing that it shall largely consist of articles manufactured abroad, without regard to the fact that protective duties can bring about a similar increase in the volume of foreign trade while at the same time guarding our own industries.

Reciprocity, though sharply criticised in some quarters, meets with popular approval. This administration has labored earnestly and successfully to enlarge our foreign markets for our surplus productions. Restrictions placed upon the importation of our agricultural products have been reduced by treaties negotiated with Germany and Austria. Similar negotiations have resulted in commercial arrangements with Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Brazil, Santo Domingo, Cuba, Puerto Rico, British Guiana, Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbadoes, and the British colonies of the Leeward and Windward Islands, representing a population of nearly 30,000,000 and an annual commerce of $600,000,000. These negotia-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions are in progress of sure extension. Under the generous concessions thus secured, nearly all the agricultural products of this country and a large number of manufactured articles are admitted free into half of the ports of America south of the Rio Grande, and a much larger list of merchandise is admitted at rates twenty-five and fifty per cent lower than those imposed upon similar articles imported from Europe, giving a marked advantage to our people. Nearly every article we can produce for export can be bought in the countries named at prices much below those asked by European competitors, who formerly enjoyed almost a monopoly of them. It remains for our people to improve their opportunities. The disturbed condition of some of the countries has retarded a growth that might reasonably have been expected. Under more favorable conditions, our exports to Cuba since the treaty went into effect, September 1, 1891, have been $13,104,879 as against $8,907,937 for the corresponding period of the previous year.

In the field covered by the Interior Department a great work has been accomplished. Six new States have been brought into the Union, giving promise of future greatness. The Indian service has been vastly improved; its appointees have been brought under the civil-service rules; the school attendance has increased thirteen per cent. About 23,000,000 acres, or nearly 36,000 square miles, have been acquired for homestead settlement. Twenty-seven thousand six hundred and nineteen Indians have been naturalized and have taken their allotments of land.

The Pension Office has done an enormous business, and has successfully run the gantlet of bitter criticism. It is not shown that a dollar has been misappropriated or a single pension claim corruptly allowed or disallowed. The pension law of 1890, of which so much has been said, simply declares that whenever an ex-soldier, ex-sailor, or ex-marine becomes unable to maintain himself by reason of disability not arising from any fault of his own conduct he shall be entitled to a proportionate pension ranging from $6 to $12 a month, without regard to rank. This is not to derogate from his rights under existing pension law. This pensions no able-bodied man. It provides that no disabled man shall be without some measure of assistance. Such assistance he would sooner or later be obliged to ask from the authorities of his own locality. But the obligation is one of the whole country, and the whole country has cheerfully assumed it. To those who make much of the great expenditures in this behalf, let

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

me say that in 1867 the pensions amounted to about $21,000,000. They are now about $140,000,000. But in the mean time the interest on the public debt has run down from $144,000,000 in 1867 to about $23,000,000. The burden of the war, in 1892, then, is just about what it was in 1867, while the population of the country has increased from 6,000,000 to 64,000,000. The cost *per capita* in 1867 was about $4.50; it is in 1892 about $2.50. The Republican party has no fear that the nation will not be willing to deal justly and kindly in this behalf. It is supposed that the number of pensions will reach their maximum within the next year.

The new Department of Agriculture has fully justified its creation. We have ceased to hear of the calamity of pleuro-pneumonia. Loud and incessant objection in England to the admission of American cattle because of alleged disease has been silenced by the inspection in Great Britain, by our own inspectors, of all live-stock imported from the United States, as well as by an efficient system of inspection and identification on this side. The prohibition in Europe of the introduction of American pork has disappeared because of the system of inspection organized by the Department, which has proved feasible, economical, and successful. The gravest difficulties affecting interstate cattle trade, by reason of clashing State regulations, have been reduced to a minimum. The scientific publications of the Department have been increased in variety and value. The development of our sugar interests has been greatly promoted. By a diligent spread in Europe of knowledge concerning the treatment and value of the great American crop, Indian corn, its export has been very greatly increased. Judging from figures already obtainable, our exports of corn and corn-meal to Germany will exceed those of last year tenfold.

The Attorney-General has in the Supreme Court successfully defended the Government in the matter of the new tariff and various other important legislative acts, notably among them the Dingley act in relation to worsteds, in which the Supreme Court sustained Speaker Reed's counting of a quorum. He has successfully prosecuted outrages upon government officials and reduced fee-making. Since March 4, 1889, there have been appointed two supreme, nine circuit, twenty-one district, and five land court judges. The mental and moral fitness of these men for high office has been unquestioned, and for the first time a President has appointed a judge not of his own party.

The Post-office Department has grown faster than the country. The money-order offices have been increased from 8,734 at the begin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ning of this administration to 12,066 at the end of its first three years. The foreign mails have been prepared on board ship for distribution. The application of the civil-service rules to the Department has been greatly improved. The free-delivery system has been put in operation in forty-six rural communities, and the increase in revenue has balanced the increased expense.

In the matter of rivers and harbors a vast improvement in the way of economy has been made by putting certain classes of work under continuing contracts running through the entire work, instead of doing it by piecemeal. The saving is from 10 to 33 per cent. An efficient system of coast defences devised by the engineers has received the sanction of Congress by a liberal appropriation for guns and mortar batteries at Boston, New York, and San Francisco. Great progress has been made in the manufacture of heavy guns. A gun foundry of the first class at Watervliet is nearing its completion.

The construction of the new navy was begun by a Republican Congress in 1883, which ordered four new vessels. The administration of Secretary Whitney was employed in the construction of 16 new vessels aggregating 46,646 tons. The administration of Secretary Tracy has been building a total of 36 new vessels, aggregating 122,573 tons, or, adding the old monitors, now taken up for completion, a total under construction during this administration of 41 vessels of 143,893 tons. Sixteen vessels have been completed and put into commission, and 10 launched. Of the 24 now under construction, 19 have been constructed entirely during this administration. The new vessels represent a decided departure from previous types, and a marked advance. The three types are: the battle ships, the armored cruiser, and the swift protected cruiser. The production of armor-piercing projectiles has been for the first time developed here. In torpedoes, in the manufacture and test of armor, the invention of a new smokeless powder, and the perfection of its Washington gun foundry, the Navy Department has distinguished itself. The employment of labor at the navy yards has been greatly elevated by the introduction of practical examinations of all employees. A naval militia has been created. The history of the quiet but rapid and effective preparations made for possible difficulties with Chili is exceedingly creditable, but cannot be described here.

President Harrison has steadily and heartily supported the Civil Service Commission in endeavoring to secure a faithful enforcement of the law. He has extended its provisions to the superintendents,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teachers, matrons, and physicians in the Indian service and to employees of the Fish Commission. He has provided a rule for voluntary competitive examination for promotion in the departments at Washington. Likewise he has directed the heads of departments to keep an "efficiency record" of all their classified employees. The last two changes have made a very marked improvement in various places. No person has done more for the improvement of the public service.

From Republican sources has come legislation that bids fair to have a strong influence in reviving the American mercantile marine. Strongly in the interest of justice is the extradition treaty with Canada that will remove the existing scandals to both countries resulting from the easy refuge opened in either to criminals from the other. The writer hereof, upon inquiry addressed to the Treasury and other departments, has failed to find a single instance in which the Government has been the loser in the collection or disbursement of public funds during this administration. This may seem extraordinary, but it is positively affirmed. It is without a parallel in our history.

Upon the much-vexed silver question the Republican party has a principle and a purpose. It desires the use of gold and silver as a constitutional currency, and is beyond measure anxious to arrive at some method which will remove existing embarrassments. While the silver act of 1890 may be open to criticism, it was a sincere attempt, and has thus far at least caused no injury to the public. The clear and earnest appeal of Mr. Harrison to other nations to join us in a conference is the most practicable measure now before us. Neither upon this nor upon any other great question has Mr. Harrison left us without a vigorous declaration of his principles. He said at Albany, August 18, 1891:

"I do believe that the General Government is solemnly charged with the duty of seeing that the money issued by it is always at par. I believe that I speak that which is the common thought of us all when I say that every dollar, whether paper or coin, issued or stamped by the General Government should always and everywhere be as good as any other dollar. . . .

"These men from your shops, these farmers remote from money centres, have the largest interest of all people in the world in having a dollar that is worth one hundred cents every day in the year, and only such. If by any chance we should fall into a condition where one dollar is not as good as another, I venture the assertion that the poorer dollar will do its first errand in paying some poor laborer for his work."

The battle of the tariff is again to be fought. While not all Democrats are free-traders, all free-traders are Democrats, and all pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tectionists are Republicans. Within the borders of these United States, and somewhere in its various climates, soils, and mines, is to be found nearly everything necessary to the existence of the human race. In this simple statement, in my judgment, is to be found an implied and imperative duty of our Government to assist in developing these matchless resources. British statisticians say that Great Britain goes abroad for about 93 per cent of her raw material, and proceed to declare that the United States obtain about the same percentage of raw material within their own borders. Great Britain may well be a free-trader, for she has spent centuries of violent effort to build up her industries by protection; and having them well advanced, she finds it economical to insist upon a free-trade competition. No people is truly prosperous that is given up to any one leading branch of human effort. Neither in a country almost wholly given to manufacturing nor in one chiefly devoted to agriculture are the aptitudes of the people fully developed. Nothing but a wise distribution of all the methods of human effort can call out every capacity. Therefore it is not for purely economical reasons only, but for moral and mental purposes as well, that we should endeavor to establish among us the production of everything needed by the human race. Said a free-trader, writing of the United States, "Blessed is the nation that is self-dependent and not always asking what other peoples are doing."

That man is not narrow and selfish who thinks that his primary duty is to his own family. Likewise every patriot should seek to put his country at the head of the list of nations. It is a wasteful folly to send our raw material thousands, or even hundreds, of miles to be manufactured and returned to us, when we have the ingenuity and every facility for manufacturing for ourselves. The principal scientists of modern times rack their brains to reduce the cost of transportation; the protectionist strives for the practically total elimination thereof by bringing the producer and consumer into close neighborhood.

The prosperity of a country is not measured alone by the number and tonnage of its ships. The tonnage of Great Britain is said to be 8,235,854. The Census Bulletin estimates the tonnage of the United States, largely engaged in coastwise and interior traffic (including the great barges), at 7,833,676. We are busy with the great home commerce denied to England by her contracted limits. In one year we built 10,000 miles of railroad, worth $600,000,000, or $50,000,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than all Great Britain's shipping; and that 10,000 miles is but one-sixteenth of our railroad system more truly devoted to commerce than ships making long voyages to bring home articles we ought to make for ourselves. The value of farming lands throughout the United States is, without exception, high or low, in precise harmony with the extent to which there are manufacturing interests in the neighborhood. Free-traders seem to insist that protection is a thing wrong in itself, whereas it is but a matter of time and place, dependent upon the situation where it is practised. The free-trader has no moral right to demand that our people, who are better fed and clothed and housed than any other, and who consequently have more productive force, should be put into an unlimited competition with all the underfed and undeveloped peoples of the world. By this the free-trader drives directly to a reduction of wages, and vainly denies it. The tariff act of 1890 brought about legitimately, and in full accord with the protective doctrine, a great increase in free imports and a decrease in the dutiable.

The Republican party can never forget its duty to exert national power to protect national voting. Only the Republican party has the right or the desire to put in its platform the words: "Every legal voter has the right to vote once and have that vote counted." Yet it is the simplest truism. The systematic, persistent purpose to nullify the vote of a class of citizens enables the Solid South to promise the Democratic party fifteen solid States.

There can be no harm in mentioning that Benjamin Harrison's great-grandfather was a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and that his grandfather was a civic and military leader of the pioneers of the great West and a President of the United States. It cannot be an objection to his reëlection. Perhaps the memories of their honorable lives inspired him. Unknown and poor, he won his way to the front rank of the bar in his adopted State. He was a gallant soldier. He became a distinguished senator. Ably seconded by his Cabinet, he has conducted an administration unsurpassed in general for its zeal, vigor, and success. He has honorably settled seriously embarrassing foreign questions. In every field of effort he has made distinct progress. There has been neither failure nor scandal. His private life has no shadow of reproach.

The great and serious business of the country, involving the fortunes of the poor as well as the rich, has learned to proceed calmly in the perfect confidence that any legislation, however apparently popu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lar, that threatened injury to honor or prosperity would receive his determined veto. Let me quote from myself:

"Benjamin Harrison has proved himself one of the ablest statesmen of the line of Presidents. He conducted the Treasury when the Secretary was disabled. He became Secretary of State when Mr. Blaine was compelled to close his portfolio. He is a well-qualified substitute for any member of his Cabinet. Beginning with that Cabinet, his appointments of judges and foreign ministers, commissioners, agents, officers of all the higher classes, have met hearty and often enthusiastic approval. In the campaign preceding his election, in his journeys throughout the country, and on various minor opportunities, he has made many hundred speeches, usually brief, but always carrying thought and never shunning an issue—made them with the greatest felicity; and has had the unprecedented good fortune amounting to genius to have never uttered a phrase picked up by the enemy for catch-words of criticism. His state papers exhibit the learning and logic of the lawyer, the breadth of the statesman, the fearless manliness appropriate to his high office."

JOS. R. HAWLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT MR. CLEVELAND STANDS FOR.

"How is it that you, an original member of the Republican party and an officer in the Union army all through the war of the Rebellion, —how is it that you, with this political and military record, are now a supporter of the presidential candidate of the Democratic party?" This question has recently been put to me; it is a fair question; it comes from a responsible source, and is put, not idly or out of mere curiosity, but because I am believed to be one of a class, more or less numerous, and it is assumed, correctly or otherwise, that the considerations which have influenced me have also influenced those who feel and act much as I feel and act. Though the voice of almost no one carries far amid the tumult of a presidential canvass, I propose to answer the question. But before doing so, and in order to make my answer intelligible, it is necessary to cast a rapid glance backward.

It was in 1856, the year in which the Republican party came into existence—and in which also James Buchanan was elected President—that I cast my first vote. It is needless to say that I did not vote for Mr. Buchanan. My virgin vote was deposited for John C. Fremont, the "Pathfinder," as we then called him. And I may add, by way of reminiscence, that since then, like most men who take an interest always and occasionally an active hand in political movements, I have experienced some disappointments, and at times felt that the bottom, so to speak, of things, if it had not actually already tumbled out, was in imminent danger of so doing. But, looking back over an interval of more than a third of a century, I am now free to say that never at any time do I remember to have experienced so bitter a sense of political disappointment and temporary discouragement as when a merciful Providence, through the result of the Pennsylvania State election of October, 1856, saved the young Republican party from the grave disaster of a premature success. Since that time I have cast my vote in eight presidential elections; six times for the successful candidate and twice for the candidate who failed of success. So, as an adult, I have seen nine such elections; and I have further a most vivid recollection of the two others which immediately preceded those nine.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Passing in review the whole eleven of these conflicts from the standpoint of the threshold of the twelfth, I find myself forced to the conclusion that in the course of them I have been through a great deal of most unnecessary anxiety, and witnessed the expenditure of a vast amount of energy and enthusiasm with very inadequate returns; because, though generally I have been on the winning side, and so at the moment seen my country saved from what appeared to be imminent peril, yet now, looking back over the lines of that country's development and the political battle-fields which marked and more or less deflected those lines, I really cannot help feeling that so far as the country as a whole is concerned, the grand result would in the long run have been about the same whether at any particular election, with one exception only, the party I sympathized with had won the day or whether the other party had won it. The single exception was the election of 1864, the second election of President Lincoln. That election all, I think, must agree was of vital importance; and for the obvious reason, which Lincoln himself either gave or would have given, that it was not politic to attempt to swap horses while crossing a river. The country was most undeniably then crossing a river, a river swift and dangerous, and the transfer of political power from one party to the other at that time would, so far as all human judgment can decide, have been disastrous. But with this single exception, I do not see how a different result in any one of the last eleven presidential elections could have affected the grand course of events further than slightly to hasten or retard it, or possibly to deflect it to an extent in no way material.

Thus in these days of profound peace and great material prosperity, some of us, the veterans now of many noisy but innocuous presidential conflicts and of one actual and awful war—some of us, I say, seeing the general prosperity of the country we fought to preserve, and not being able to shut our eyes to the eager patriotism of the people, no matter by what party lines they may divide themselves—seeing all this, we find it somewhat difficult to work up in ourselves the old enthusiasm, or to be very earnest partisans, or to feel that every fourth year is "the most important in the country's history." Moreover, so far as the Republican party is concerned, the party of our youth and devotion, the present battle-cries of that organization have to our ears a somewhat unfamiliar sound. It was William M. Evarts, I think, who many years ago, probably during the second administration of Grant, remarked that "the Republican party was like an army

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the term of enlistment of which had expired." The saying was as true as it was incisive. As I hold it, there have been only two political parties in the United States since the present National Government was organized which have left behind them the record of a great work of lasting historical importance accomplished. One of those two parties was the original Federal party, the party of Washington; the other was the original Republican party, the party of Lincoln. The Federal party organized and firmly established the Union of the States under a National Government; and the Republican party triumphantly carried that Union and that Government through the crucial stress of a great civil war. All the other parties and party conflicts of these hundred years of national history are, so far as I am competent to judge, mere matters of detail, and will prove hardly deserving of the future historian's notice.

It was to meet the issues of a great crisis then manifestly impending that the Republican party came into existence in 1856, and the young men of the North enlisted in its ranks. The mottoes inscribed on its banners were plain enough and understood by all. Neither was the work before it to do matter for much question. That work it did, and it did it completely—far more completely than it was originally proposed to do it. When the work the Republican party was organized to do was thus done, and fully and irreversibly done, the term of service of those who enlisted literally for that war expired by its own limitation. New issues then presented themselves, new leaders came to the front, new battle-cries were heard, and the name of Republican attached to a party organization became a mere tradition and sentiment—a trade-mark, as it were, representing what might most aptly be described as a very valuable political good-will.

Such are the general conditions of to-day as seen by some of us, original members of the Republican party, and faithful to it until the work it was formed to do was done; then, ceasing to call ourselves Republicans, we have seen no good reason for identifying ourselves with the Democratic or with any other political faction. We have felt satisfied with being simply citizens of that common country which, as members of the original Republican party, we helped to save. Why, then, do some of us now come forward, not calling ourselves Democrats, and earnestly advocate the election to the presidency of the candidate of the Democratic party? My answer is: We do so simply because that candidate is ex-President Cleveland.

What are the political issues of the impending canvass? Some of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them are old, as old as the National Government, and likely long to continue; others are new and of a passing character. These issues, new and old, may be enumerated somewhat as follows: 1. The economic and commercial system, commonly known as protective, based upon the idea that it is the business of government artificially to foster, or even call into existence, various branches of industry. 2. The purification and reform of the civil service; or, as Mr. Carl Schurz once tersely expressed it, "the disestablishment of the spoils system," the system which the Jacksonian Democracy introduced. 3. What is known as the "currency question," now taking the form of a demand for the free coinage of silver at the national mint at an artificial ratio with gold. 4. The pension system.

What is the attitude of Mr. Cleveland so far as these issues are concerned? He has been called upon officially to confront them all, and on no occasion, so far as I know, has he failed to make his position understood, or to give the party of which he was the head a distinct, recognized, and creditable lead. He has not shuffled or vacillated; his voice at least has, upon these issues, emitted no uncertain sound. In this respect the line of responsible public action he has pursued has been in most agreeable contrast with that usually pursued by politicians, not only of the present, but of all time. The crying sin of cattle of that class, especially in these days of many newspapers and much rapid communication, is their constant endeavor to catch quickly and to reflect correctly the passing phases of public sentiment, and neither to think nor to speak for themselves. Continually playing a game of political chess and small party tactics, they are very chary of enunciating any political principles by which they are prepared to stand or fall, unless such principles are time-honored political platitudes or orthodox party shibboleth. But such has not been the practice of Mr. Cleveland. In high public position he has stood forth a clean-cut political character—a man with the courage of his convictions.

Take his course on the question of civil-service reform, that one of the issues enumerated in regard to which his record may seem to be most open to attack. Under the lead of Grover Cleveland the Democratic party came back into power in 1885 after twenty-eight years of exclusion from it. It is no exaggeration to say that those calling themselves Democrats were then simply ravenous for spoils. No more severe pressure for a general turning out of officials and a new distribution of places was probably ever brought to bear upon the head of a government than was brought to bear upon President

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cleveland after his inauguration. I have not the figures before me, nor do I care to look them up, but I think it will be found that the removals during President Cleveland's administration were fewer in number and less dictated by partisan or political considerations than those of President Harrison, who succeeded him. Yet President Harrison represented a party which when Cleveland was inaugurated had been in power for over a quarter of a century, filling every office in the gift of the Government, and many of these officials had held over notwithstanding the change which took place in 1885. President Harrison also represented the party which claims to be and which should be essentially the party of civil-service reform. Yet, so far as the use of party power for political purposes is concerned, the administration of Grover Cleveland will have little to fear from a comparison of its record with that of Benjamin Harrison. It may well be that in this matter there is little to choose as between the politicians of the two great parties; but in view of the record, it cannot but be conceded that Mr. Cleveland, in the trying position in which he was placed, acquitted himself as creditably as any man could have been expected to do. Upon the issue of a reformed civil service he showed himself as much in advance of both parties as it was wise or prudent for the recognized leader of one of those parties to be. He may not have been—probably he was not—on the skirmish line; but then a general in command is not in his proper place on the skirmish line.

On the next issue, that of protection, whether the critic be a protectionist or otherwise, he must still admit that President Cleveland's course was most creditable to him. Indeed, it may well be questioned whether any President, in dealing with an important question of public policy, ever acted from higher or more disinterested motives than did Cleveland when he took the course he did in his annual message of 1887. Before that message was sent in, it was generally conceded that all the President had to do to secure a reëlection was silently to bide the time. The course of events and the drift of public opinion were in his favor. The terrible results his opponents had so confidently predicted from a return of the Democratic party to power had not come about. The country was at peace and very prosperous; the South was pacified and loyal; the Treasury was overflowing. All things indicated popular confidence in the administration and unwillingness to disturb it. Nevertheless, when President Cleveland, after the most thorough and careful investigation he could make, had con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vinced himself that the tariff system needed modification, he did not hesitate to cast all further ulterior considerations aside and boldly to indicate his opinion. It is no sort of consequence whether his so doing was "good politics," as it is called, or "bad politics"; it is no sort of consequence whether, as a question of party strategy, it was a success or a failure; it is no sort of consequence whether by doing as he then did President Cleveland showed skill as a political leader or committed a serious political blunder, his course none the less showed character and courage; and the Anglo-Saxon race has always evinced a proclivity for men of character and courage.

It was the same with the question of silver coinage. That issue was and is unmistakably before the country and has got to be fought out. It was unnecessary for ex-President Cleveland, as he then was, to express in February last any opinion upon it. It was perfectly within his power, by preserving a discreet silence, to hold himself in position where those in favor of a free coinage of silver and those who were opposed to it could equally lend him their support. He might have dodged the issue. Nevertheless, here again the courage and character of the man asserted themselves. His letter of February 10, 1891, to the Cooper Union meeting was, as I look upon it, under all the circumstances of the case, one of the most creditable utterances that ever came from an American public character. He did not want to have his position misunderstood. He did not propose to stand before the country in any false or uncertain attitude. So, again, his voice, when heard, emitted no uncertain sound.

Finally, the question of pensions. On this subject I speak with some degree of feeling, because, having served through nearly four years of the Civil War, I, in common with many others who did the same, feel a sense of humiliation—I may almost say of degradation—in seeing the uniform we once wore turned into a mendicant's garb, and the garb of a very impudent and persistent mendicant at that. Under the administrations which preceded that of Cleveland the pension legislation had, as we thought, been already carried to excessive length. Grant and Garfield, we knew, were of the same opinion. Under it every man who had any reasonable claim to public consideration had received recognition, or the way to recognition was open to him. My own experience, I presume—and, indeed, I know—had in a small way been that of nearly every one else who was in immediate command of men during the Rebellion. We had seen every dead-beat and malingerer, every bummer, bounty-jumper, and sus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pected deserter we had ever known or heard of rush to the front as the greedy claimant of public bounty. If there was any man whose army record had been otherwise than creditable to him, we soon heard of him as the claimant of a back pension of many hundred dollars or as being in the regular receipt of his monthly stipend. On the other hand, those good and faithful soldiers who, in the day of trial, had been found in the front rank in presence of the enemy—those men had, since the flags were furled away, developed, as a rule, the same characteristics as citizens which had distinguished them as soldiers; self-respecting and self-sustaining, they were reluctant to trade on the patriotism of their younger and better days as on a beggar's claim. They had supported the brunt of battle then, and they were able to support themselves now. Thus there were of us those who felt that this wretched *largess* business, this trading of political hucksters on patriotic self-sacrifice, had gone quite far enough. We therefore felt a keen sense of relief when, in February, 1887, President Cleveland sent in his veto of that Dependent Pension bill, which put a premium on self-abasement and perjury.

But President Cleveland's cogent reasoning in that message failed to commend itself to the army of pension agents, the circulars from whose offices at Washington cumbered the mails and our desks. The Republican party, that party to which we had belonged until it completed its work, took the same view of the subject. Accordingly, so far as could be judged from the outside, the issue made by that party in the campaign of 1888, which resulted in the election of Harrison, was distinct and simple. It set itself in direct opposition to the public policy which President Cleveland had enunciated as respects what may be called the "protected interests" of the country and the pension agents. It turned to those two powerful and wide-spread organizations, saying to the first: "If you will elect our candidate to the presidency and return us to power, you can come to Washington and demand such an increase of your protective duties as you shall see fit; and we will see that it is given to you." It then turned to the army of claim agents in and about the Pension Office, saying to them: "If you will elect our candidate to the presidency and cause the administration of the country to return into our hands, we will allow you the free plunder of the Treasury. President Cleveland, as you see, bars your way to it."

The result was that by a narrow vote President Cleveland was defeated and General Harrison elected to succeed him. The Republi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can party returned to power. After it returned to power, the record shows that it was as good as its word. Its promises were carried out. The protected interests swarmed to Washington, and in due time the McKinley Tariff bill was reported and passed. In it the demands of every producer, so far as appears, who wished to fatten at the expense of the consumer, were gratified. He had but to ask and it was given. On the other hand, the horde of claim agents ran riot in the Pension Office under "Corporal Joe" Tanner until the Treasury which President Cleveland left only too full bade fair to be empty. The record in this respect is one of which the quondam soldiers of the Republic cannot well feel proud. The Treasury was looted.

Those who feel thus on the questions now before the country feel also that the issue involved in the present canvass is by no means a vital one. Whichever way it goes, the United States will prosper and go on in its course of irresistible development along the lines marked out as the result of the discussions of the century just closed and of the irreversible course of its events. Where they are not purely fiscal and economic, the issues involved in the contest of 1892 seem destined to be largely personal. They can affect nothing which is fundamental to our Government, nor will any mistake made be irremediable. Under such circumstances it has ever been found that heresies and the errors into which people fall in consequence of them can be depended on in due course of time to rectify themselves. The disease is self-limited and will work its own cure. Parties, too, are strangely divided. There is, for instance, a recognized element among the Republicans which favors a modification of the tariff, another which insists on the free coinage of silver, and yet another which looks with alarm and disgust upon new pension raids on the Treasury. So also with the Democrats. Indeed, there is no one distinctive question upon which the whole Republican party is divided from the whole Democratic party, or the whole Democratic party from the Republican. The ranks are mixed. Under such circumstances, the issue is necessarily more or less an issue of individual men: Who is to be the temporary head of the Government for the next four years?

Such being the case, those who feel as I feel, caring far more for country than for faction—for things than for names—see in Mr. Cleveland a man both true and tried, a political leader far in advance of his party, a public character with the courage of his convictions, a statesman whose views on every political issue are definite and well known, a possible President who if elected can have no ulterior political ends

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in view, for he cannot be a candidate to succeed himself. Opposed to Mr. Cleveland, we see the partisan candidate of a political party the recent record of which has not served to fill us with admiration. Our pride and patriotism are not stirred at the mention of the diplomatic victories achieved by it in its disgraceful Chilian fiasco; nor does its policy of taxing every human being in the country in the name of protection in order to call into existence an industry in tin plates commend itself to our business judgment, any more than the proposition that a natural and economical desire to buy "a cheap coat" indicates "a cheap man"; while, moreover, we look with absolute and unspeakable disgust, not unmixed with alarm, upon the noisy crowd of thieves and mendicants who, under the lead of an aggressive, well-organized staff of pension agents, constitute the acknowledged camp-following of the latter-day Republican organization, and, as such, beset the doors of the Treasury. Finally, if the published utterances of ex-President Cleveland upon all the leading issues of the day constitute what is now Democracy, then I and those who feel as I do must for the time being submit, for the reasons I have given, to be accounted Democrats. So far as the nominee for the presidency is concerned, we certainly propose next November to vote as such.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WRITERS AND SUBJECTS IN THE JULY FORUM.

JAMES FAIRBANKS COLBY (*Necessity for Uniform State Laws*), born in St. Johnsbury, Vt., was graduated at Dartmouth College in 1872 and from the Columbian Law School, at Washington, in 1875, and was clerk of the House committee on revision of the laws during the Forty-third Congress. He was instructor in law, economics, and history in the Sheffield School of Yale from 1877 till 1881. He practised law in New Haven, Conn., in 1881–85, and served as instructor in international law in the Yale Law School in 1883–85. Since 1885 he has been professor of law and political science at Dartmouth.

A. A. MCLEOD (*The Coal Supply and the Reading Leases*) is about forty-five years old. He has won his present position as president of the Philadelphia and Reading Railway by his energy and his executive ability. To him belongs the credit for the consummation of the leases of the Jersey Central and the Lehigh Valley railroads.

COL. THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE (*A Glance at the European Armies*) was born in Pittsfield, Mass., May 28, 1842. He received a military education at Berlin under Gen. Von Frohreich, was graduated at University College, London, in 1861, and entered the American regular army as a private, rising to the rank of captain and brevet-colonel. He retired in 1870. He has written, among other works, "A Bird's-Eye View of the Civil War," "A Chat in the Saddle," and studies of Alexander and Hannibal.

WILLIAM C. EDGAR (*Russia's Land System: the Cause of the Famine*) was born in La Crosse, Wis., in 1856, and lived in St. Louis until 1882. Since then he has been connected with the "Northwestern Miller," first as its business manager and since 1889 as its manager and editor. Mr. Edgar was one of the commissioners appointed by Governor Merriam, of Minnesota, and Governor Boyd, of Nebraska, to see that the contributions made through the efforts of his publication were properly distributed. He superintended the transshipment of the food to Russia and then visited the famine district.

WILLIAM SHARP (*Thomas Hardy and His Novels*), born in England in 1855, was educated at the University of Glasgow. Since his graduation he has travelled in Australia, Europe, and in America, has edited "The Canterbury Poets," published a life of Rossetti, several volumes of verse and fiction, and contributed copiously to the leading English and American periodicals.

ISAAC L. RICE (*The Consumer*), born in 1850, is a graduate of the Columbia Law School. He established the Academy of Political Science, and was a lecturer on law in Columbia from 1883 to 1886. He has contributed articles on political economy and philosophy to the "North American Review" and the FORUM, and he is president of the Forum Publishing Company.

ROGER SHERMAN (*The Standard Oil Trust: the Gospel of Greed*) was born in Tennessee in 1839, studied law, and in 1865 settled in Venango County,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pa. He moved thence to Titusville in 1870, where he has since been practising law. He was the legal counsel for the Petroleum Producers' Associations in their litigations with the railroads and the Standard Oil Company in 1877–80.

MRS. SCHUYLER VAN RENSSELAER (*The Waste of Women's Intellectual Force*) was born in New York City, where she now lives, and was educated in this country and in Germany. She has devoted herself to the study of art and architecture. She is the author of "Six Portraits," a collection of essays on artists and their works, "American Etchers," a life of Richardson, the architect, and she is a frequent contributor to the magazines.

CARROLL D. WRIGHT (*Why Women are Paid Less than Men*), born in Dunbarton, N. H., in 1840, was admitted to the bar in 1865. He moved to Massachusetts, where he served in the State senate in 1871–72. He was chief of the State Bureau of Statistics of Labor in 1873–88, appointed supervisor of the United States Census in Massachusetts in 1880, and in 1885 first commissioner of the Bureau of Labor, in the Interior Department at Washington.

GEORGE W. CABLE (*Does the Negro Pay for His Education?*) was born in New Orleans in 1844. After serving in the Confederate army he engaged in mercantile life in New Orleans, but he abandoned business for literature. He has had notable success as a writer of fiction. Among his novels are "Old Creole Days," "The Grandissimes," "Madame Delphine," and "Doctor Sevier." A few years ago he moved to Northampton, Mass., where he now lives.

JOSEPH ROSWELL HAWLEY (*Mr. Harrison's Sound Administration*) was born in Stewartsville, N. C., in 1826. He moved to Connecticut in 1837, to Cazenovia, N. Y., in 1842, and was graduated at Hamilton College in 1847. He then taught school and studied law, and began to practise in 1850. In 1857 he gave up the law and became editor of the Hartford "Evening Press." He served with distinction through the Civil War. In 1866 he was elected governor of Connecticut, entered Congress in 1872, was elected to the United States Senate in 1881 and reëlected in 1887. His term expires in 1893.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS (*What Mr. Cleveland Stands For*), born in Boston, 1835, was graduated at Harvard in 1856 and admitted to the bar in 1858. He won the rank of brigadier-general of volunteers for his services in the Civil War. He has since devoted himself chiefly to railway interests. In 1869 he was made a member of the board of railroad commissioners of Massachusetts, and in 1884 he was elected president of the Union Pacific. He has published a book on railway accidents, and with his brother, Henry Adams, "Chapters of Erie, and Other Essays."

ERRATUM: The sentence in Bishop Potter's article on page 352 of the May FORUM, beginning at line 31, should read: It was not the "enthusiasm of humanity," it was not any doctrine of altruism, it was the touch of that spell of love which they had learned, however obscurely, from the cross of Christ.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED